



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 105th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 144

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MARCH 17, 1998

No. 29

House of Representatives

The House met at 12:30 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
March 17, 1998.

I hereby designate the Honorable DAVID L. HOBSON to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING HOUR DEBATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 21, 1997, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning hour debates. The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties, with each party limited to 30 minutes, and each Member, except the majority leader, the minority leader, or the minority whip, limited to 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. VISCLOSKY) for 5 minutes.

CONGRATULATIONS TO VALPARAISO UNIVERSITY MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the people of Northwest Indiana that I represent and as an Indiana University and Notre Dame University graduate, I want to congratulate Valparaiso University, which is in the First Congressional District of Indiana. I want to congratulate the Valparaiso men's basketball team on their impressive wins in the first and second rounds of the NCAA Tournament. It is a re-

markable achievement for Valparaiso University and a great source of pride for me and the citizens I represent.

Valparaiso is the smallest school represented in the tournament, with a total of 2,700 undergraduate students. Nonetheless, Valparaiso has seen a level of success few teams have experienced. They have won both the regular season conference title and the Mid-Continent Conference tournament title for the last 4 years, a feat accomplished by only three other teams in NCAA history.

Valparaiso has been to the NCAA tournament twice before this year. It was unable to advance beyond the first round. This year it is different. Valparaiso has now become only the second 13-seed in history to advance to the Sweet Sixteen. Their opening round win over the University of Mississippi last Friday was nothing short of inspiring.

For the six senior players who have fought hard to bring success to this team and this school, it was an amazing culmination of determination and perseverance that led to their victory. Bryce Drew's 3-point shot to win the game was reminiscent of the final scene in the movie "Hoosiers," in which a tiny high school team came together in the waning seconds to win the championship game against a much larger and more powerful foe.

After Valparaiso's second-round overtime win over Florida State on Sunday, coach Homer Drew said, "Only in America and only in the NCAA Tournament can you have the opportunity to go against the best athletes and the best programs in America. We beat two schools from the best conferences in America."

Coach Drew and his team have proven that hard work and persistence eventually lead to success. The coach has spent the last 10 seasons building the basketball program that exists today. His dedication to the success of

the program and the success of his players merits recognition. In the last 6 years, he has seen 80 percent of his players graduate, a higher rate than the school has as a whole. Further, all six players on this year's team who are seniors are set to graduate. He has been a positive influence on his students, a model of sportsmanship on the sidelines, an example of the type of hard work that makes the people of Northwest Indiana great.

Not only has Valparaiso University continued to shine on the basketball court, but the school itself has a stellar academic record. Valparaiso has consistently ranked in the top 15 of regional universities, as published by U.S. News and World Report. This year, of the over 500 colleges listed, Valparaiso is ranked number two of the best universities in the Midwest, and Valparaiso's overall graduation rate of 72 percent makes them one of the best schools around.

I would like to wish Coach Drew and the Valparaiso Crusaders the best of luck for their game against the University of Rhode Island on Friday. This is an exciting time for the people I represent and for college basketball fans everywhere.

REMOVING U.S. ARMED FORCES FROM BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. PAUL) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PAUL asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAUL. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw to the attention of my colleagues two House concurrent resolutions that we will be voting on, one today and one tomorrow.

The one tomorrow is offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. CAMPBELL), which I think we should pay

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper containing 100% post consumer waste

H1169

close attention to and, hopefully, support. This is H. Con. Res. 227. It is a concurrent resolution directing the President, pursuant to section 5(c) of the War Powers Resolution, to remove United States Armed Forces from the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

The troops should never have been sent there in the first place. There was a lot of controversy. It was far from unanimous consent from the Congress to send the troops there. They were sent there in 1995, and they were to be there for 18 months, and each time we came upon a date for removing the troops, they were extended.

Currently, it is the President's position that the troops will stay indefinitely. He has not set a date, although the Congress has set a date for this June for all funding to be removed as of June and the troops should come home. This resolution more or less states that same position. I strongly favor this, and I believe that the Congress should send a strong message that we should not casually and carelessly send troops around the world to police the world. This is a good way for us to get into trouble.

Our national security is not threatened. There was no justification for our troops to be sent there. There are always good reasons, though, given because there are problems. Well, there are problems every place in the world. If we try to solve all the problems of the world, we would not have troops in a hundred countries like we have now, we would have them in three or four hundred countries. But it is true that we send troops with the most amount of pressure put upon us to do it.

There are certain countries, like in Rwanda, Africa, we certainly did not apply the same rules to that country as we do to Bosnia and the Persian Gulf and Iraq. We did not do this when we saw the mass killings in the Far East under Pol Pot.

So, under certain circumstances where there is political pressure made by certain allies or by interests of oil, then we are likely to get involved. But the principle of a noninterventionism foreign policy should make certain that we, the Congress, never condone, never endorse, never promote the placement of troops around the world in harm's way because it is a good way for men to get killed and, for most purposes, the lives of our American soldiers are too valuable to be put into a situation where there is so much harm and danger.

Fortunately, there has been no American deaths in this region, but there is a good reason for those troops to come out. The peace has not been settled, though, there. It is not going to be. And our 16,000 or 20,000 troops that we have had there will not be able to maintain the peace as long as these warring factions exist. They have existed not for months, not for a few years, but literally for hundreds of years if not thousands of years people in this region have been fighting among themselves.

So it is not our responsibility. Yes, we can condemn the violence; and who would not? But does that justify the taxing of American citizens and imposing a threat to American lives by imposing and sending our troops to all these hot spots around the region?

So I strongly urge my fellow colleagues to look carefully at this resolution tomorrow and assume congressional responsibility. It is not the responsibility of the President to wage war, to put troops around the world. That is a congressional responsibility.

So although there has been no declaration of war, we are sitting ducks for a war to be started. So let us stop the war before it gets started.

I think we should strongly endorse this resolution and make sure these troops come home. It is interesting that there is a fair amount of support for this, and we obviously won the vote on this last year to say the troops should come home in June of this year. I suspect and hope that this will be restated, and there will be no excuse to extend their stay in this region.

But at the same time we win those kind of votes, and there is a strong sentiment here in the Congress when we are required to vote and there is certainly a strong sentiment among the American people that we ought to be dealing with our problems here at home, we ought not to assume the role of world policemen, and we ought to mind our own business, and we ought to be concerned about the sovereignty of the United States, rather than sending our troops around the world under the auspices of the United Nations and NATO and literally giving up our sovereignty to international bodies. We were very confused as to who was really in charge of foreign policy in Iraq, whether it was Kofi Annan or whether it was our President.

AGREEMENTS BETWEEN TELEVISION STATIONS AND POLICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, Tuesday, January 27, people in my hometown of Portland, Oregon, were stunned by a series of events that stem from a drug raid gone bad. In the midst of this episode, one Portland police-woman was killed, another seriously injured, and a third received more minor injuries.

Reflecting back on this episode, Mr. Speaker, there were two areas that gave great local concern.

One was an activity involved with the coverage, the live coverage of this event by local news helicopters on the raid and the concern on the part of some that this might have interfered with the police activities at that event, both in terms of providing interference, in terms of communication with the

noise that was involved, the police direct communication, one with another, and the potential that it was possible for the gunman in this case to have used live television broadcasts to be able to monitor the events at the scene.

There was another area of great concern, and that was simply the firepower of this gunman. To say the least, it was disturbing that his private arsenal included a grenade launcher and numerous grenades, a crossbow with darts, a small arsenal of shotguns, rifles, handguns, hundreds of rounds of ammunition, including 100-round capacity magazine with 80 rounds inside.

That weapon actually used in the shooting was an SKS semiautomatic assault weapon. This weapon was powerful enough that the fatal bullet was fired through the front door, that it was possible that there were other bullets that went through the walls of the house and through both sides of police car parked outside.

The weapon in question was not on the 1994 Crime Control Bill of banned assault weapons, although that bill did prohibit the manufacture of ammunition and magazines of more than 10 rounds. However, high-capacity ammunition magazines manufactured prior to September of 1994 were exempted, with the expectation that the manufacturers would sell off the stockpiles within a few years.

Unfortunately, that 1994 ban allowed manufacturers to stockpile a seemingly unlimited supply of high-capacity ammunition magazines which are still being sold regularly today by manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers, 3 years after that ban went into effect.

This is noteworthy because, although assault weapons account for a tiny fraction of the guns in private hands, they were used in over 13 percent of the 122 fatal law enforcement shootings that took place in a 21-month period in 1994 and 1995. Of those deaths, almost 20 percent involved high-capacity magazines.

When faced with tragedy of this nature as we faced in Portland, it is important to reflect on what we learn from these circumstances. That is the true story today. The positive changes were a result of reflection on this episode.

I am pleased that the local authorities and the news media came together to deal with an area of friction in the past to establish a voluntary agreement to be used in emergency situations in the future. This agreement will ensure a safe environment for our police, while guaranteeing that the public has an access to information.

The stations will no longer show live shots of special emergency reaction teams. They will keep helicopters a mile away and at least 1,000 feet in elevation to prevent disturbance with emergency police communication.

The police will provide a location as close as possible to the emergency

event for a TV pool camera on the ground and to videotape the operation for later broadcast. The police in the communications activities with the stations have set up a special phone to give a direct link to the four local news stations.

This senseless killing served as a wake-up call for Portland. I think the model agreement that we have developed can serve as a model for other communities in the future.

I would ask my colleagues to reflect upon the situation that they may see in their community. Are there appropriate agreements in place between the news media and law enforcement in their hometowns?

It is clearly not Congress' role to have to legislate news coverage. It is, however, our role to do everything in our power to make sure that this never happens again. Congress does have a role in dealing with the trade, distribution of and availability of dangerous weapons; and I hope we will readdress this in the future.

I encourage my colleagues to learn from this Portland tragedy. To do so would mean that the sacrifice of Portland's finest will not have been in vain.

□ 1245

2000 CENSUS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MILLER) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. MILLER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to talk about the 2000 Census. I realize there are not many people in Washington focused on that subject today or this week. While the country remains fixated on the problems engulfing the White House, the business of government must go on. The 2000 Census will be the largest peacetime mobilization ever undertaken by the Federal Government, and the planning must continue.

I want to begin by complimenting and thanking Acting Director James Holmes. Last week we were headed towards a confrontation over the issue of congressional access. Last night I received word from Mr. Holmes and we have resolved the issue. I think Mr. Holmes understands how seriously Congress takes its oversight responsibilities in regard to the census. Given all the controversy surrounding the methodology of the 2000 Census, the best way to proceed is to have an open relationship in the process of information gathering. Frankly, until Mr. Holmes arrived, the administration had a different view.

Mr. Speaker, we need cooperation between Congress and the administration because at the moment the 2000 Census is in serious trouble. I have said I believe we are headed towards a failed census. The Clinton administration, without the approval of the Congress,

has designed the largest statistical experiment in U.S. history. The plan is multifaceted and complicated. If one element of the plan goes wrong, it can destroy the accuracy of the entire census. The plan depends on an unrealistic time line and if they do not meet the deadlines at each step, the plan could easily fall apart.

The Commerce Department's own Inspector General has called the plan risky. The Inspector General said in December, "We conclude that although the 2000 Census design is risky, the bureau's fundamental problem is that it simply may not have enough time to plan and implement a design that achieves its dual goals of containing cost and increasing accuracy." The Inspector General goes on to state, "Because this process is long, complex, and operating under a tight schedule, there will be many opportunities for operational and statistical errors."

I have a Ph.D. in statistics and marketing, so I understand clearly the operational risk of this plan. As a statistician, the administration plan raises too many red flags to move forward and spend \$4 billion of taxpayers' money.

Let me try and give my colleagues a basic outline of this grand experiment. There are 60,000 census tracks in the United States. Each contains about 4,000 people. Under this new, untested theory, the administration wants to count only 90 percent of the people in each census track. That is unprecedented. For the first time in American history we will not attempt to count all Americans. First, they collect all the census forms returned by mail for each of the 60,000 census tracks. They hope to average about 67 percent response rate in each track. Then in each of these 60,000 tracks, they will randomly remove enough remaining addresses to add up to 10 percent of the total census track and then put them aside. Then they will do what is called a nonresponse follow-up with the homes not removed so they have actually counted 90 percent of the people in each track. Then they will conduct 60,000 simultaneous polls to estimate the other 10 percent in each census track.

This has never been tried before. The scope of this experiment is simply breathtaking. When you see a poll in the New York Times or CNN or USA Today the pollsters typically do one poll and survey 1,000 or so Americans. I saw a poll this morning that shows the President's approval ratings just went up again, which really has to make one question the accuracy of polling. But what this administration is talking about doing is 60,000 separate simultaneous polls at the same time. It has never been tried before and the potential for mistakes and errors is quite large.

That is just the beginning. After all this has been completed, they will conduct an extensive nationwide poll of 750,000 American households. This is

done to adjust the figures in all 60,000 census tracks. Some tracks will be added to, some subtracted from, based on this poll of 750,000 households. This 750,000 survey is called the Integrated Coverage Measurement or ICM. The administration claims the ICM will increase accuracy. That is a huge theoretical leap of faith. The Commerce Inspector General says, "Because of its complexity, the ICM is highly vulnerable. In particular, the survey's magnitude, quality demands, and tight schedule all present serious challenges." He added, "Estimation associated with the ICM survey in particular faces lingering methodological questions." In other words, it is not at all clear that the experiment will increase accuracy at all. We need to work together and get the most accurate, best census we can for the year 2000, not test or try experiments.

SALUTING UNIVERSITY OF RHODE ISLAND MEN'S BASKETBALL TEAM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. WEYGAND) is recognized during morning hour debates for 3 minutes.

Mr. WEYGAND. Mr. Speaker, I rise this afternoon with great pride, because the smallest State in the country, Rhode Island, has one of the greatest basketball teams in the country, the University of Rhode Island. It won its game just two days ago against one of the powerhouses of this country, the University of Kansas, in an outstanding game that pitted a very small, some people would say even very slow, untalented basketball team against one of the giants. A team like Kansas, that had two first-team all-Americans, was unbeatable by the critics' viewpoint. Rhode Island did not have a chance. As a matter of fact, most of them did not think they had a chance against a smaller team called Murray State. But Rhode Island proved them wrong. They proved their critics wrong. More importantly, what they brought to our small State was great pride.

I am here this morning because as an alum of the University of Rhode Island, my daughter also an alumnus and my son a freshman, we could not be more happy. All of the people in the State of Rhode Island, all 1 million people, are ecstatic about what has happened. We have proven that small schools are still alive and doing well in the NCAA. We have proven that no matter what the odds may be, no matter how big the task may be, no matter how big the obstacle, even a small team in a small State can overcome those. We are extremely proud of our university, of all the things that they have become, but more importantly of their future. We look forward to Friday evening's basketball game against Valparaiso, and we join with our colleagues over there to have a celebration on Saturday

morning when we celebrate the victory for the University of Rhode Island.

REGARDING THE INTERNATIONAL MONETARY FUND

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SAXTON) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. SAXTON. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to speak to my colleagues about what I think is a very important issue. It involves the International Monetary Fund. That may be a dry issue to some. But when we consider that the International Monetary Fund today has available to it \$36 billion of American money, of U.S. dollars, it is a rather sobering thought.

We have lots of needs for money in our country, and we have seen fit in a benevolent way to help others around the world with various economic situations to the tune of \$36 billion. But what got my attention, and I hope has gotten Members' attention, is that the International Monetary Fund through Secretary Rubin, Secretary of the Treasury, has requested \$18 billion more. The signs are that that is not all they want. If we put that in perspective over the last several decades, we have contributed \$36 billion to the IMF, and this year they are asking for \$18 billion more. That is a 50 percent increase in what we have provided.

I guess the question is, is there even more to come? The issue of how much we contribute to the IMF is important. But there are other issues that are just as important, and that is questions involving how the money is used. I am not saying the money is used incorrectly, because it may very well be, but the fact of the matter is we do not know and we cannot find out, because the IMF operates in a cloak of secrecy.

Here around our government in Washington, D.C. and throughout the States, we learned decades ago that government works better when people can visualize what we are doing, when they have access to our process. The cloak of secrecy that surrounds the IMF and the reluctance or refusal of the Secretary of the Treasury and his staff to communicate with us relative to the activities of the IMF are something that needs to be changed. My experience in January and February of 1998 have revealed that there is a huge reluctance on the part of IMF officials and of the Treasury to come forth with information. In fact, they have refused on all but one occasion and when they finally agreed to permit certain information to come forward to the Joint Economic Committee, which I chair, they would have made us promise not to disclose it to anyone else. The very same cloak of secrecy would have been imposed upon us that we are trying to take away.

The issue of transparency with the IMF is extremely important. Number

two, it is also important to recognize that the IMF loans at what we call, what I call, subsidized rates. In other words, while American taxpayers are paying 7 or 7½ percent interest for mortgages, the IMF loans money to high-risk foreign investors at less than 5 percent. In fact, in the last fiscal year, the IMF loaned 90 percent of its funds that it loaned at 4.7 percent. That is a subsidized rate. While auto loans in this country go for 9 percent to 10 percent interest, the IMF was loaning at 4.7 percent to 90 percent of its borrowers. And while credit card holders in this country pay 16 to 21 percent or greater, the IMF was loaning at 4.7 percent.

It is bad enough that these subsidized rates were being used, but even worse, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to provide these loans to people who get themselves in trouble economically, does it not just encourage people to make bad loans, to take high risks? Everyone who invests in this world, in this country or this world, takes some risk. In some cases you invest in a bank. If you invest in a bank in this country, Mr. Speaker, those loans are insured. That is a low risk. But if you want to take a speculative risk, if you want to take a big risk, go get something speculative to invest in.

□ 1300

If someone is standing there by you as a benefactor saying, if you get in trouble, I have a 4.7 percent loan for you, not a bad deal. In fact, if we went out on the street corner next to the Capitol building and set up shop and said, we are going to make loans at 4.7 percent, why, we would have a line stretching around the block. That is what the IMF effectively does.

So I have introduced H.R. 3331, which is a bill that would correct the use of these funds with American money, and I urge all Members to look at it.]

THE PRESIDENT SHOULD ANSWER QUESTIONS FULLY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 21, 1997, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH) is recognized during morning hour debates for 5 minutes.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues, and those citizens who join us here in this chamber, and those citizens, Mr. Speaker, who join us electronically from coast to coast and beyond, I would commend to everyone's attention today the lead editorial in the Washington Post entitled, Ms. Willey's Story. Mr. Speaker, because this editorial is so important, I would like to read into the RECORD portions of the editorial, because I believe they make for compelling reading and offer a serious case to the American people.

When Newsweek magazine first reported allegations that President Clinton had groped Kathleen Willey in the White House, the President's lawyer,

Robert Bennett, said his client had "no specific recollection of meeting Willey in the Oval Office."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOBSON). The gentleman will suspend. The Chair would remind the gentleman that he should not refer to personal accusations against the President.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRY

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, a point of parliamentary inquiry. Is it then against the rules to also read verbatim from an editorial in a widely circulated newspaper?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the precedents, the fact that it may be in the public domain elsewhere does not mitigate the statement.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Well, I thank the Chair for the information, and I find it somewhat illuminating.

Be that as it may, that is an interesting point. For I am not here to call into question or impugn anyone's integrity, Mr. Speaker. However, there are compelling questions that confront the American people, and if duly constitutional elected Members of Congress, then, are asked to abridge or silence what is part of the public record, I would suggest perhaps that we need to review those rules even as I respect and adhere to the rules of the House.

Let me then simply read the conclusion of the editorial, which I hope will be found in concurrence with the rules of the House. I would commend to other sources the videotape that appeared on CBS on 60 Minutes, and I would commend to everyone in this Nation, Mr. Speaker, the words in this morning's Washington Post editorial. For the Post, which agrees with President Clinton on many policy decisions, today makes a very forthright point in concluding its editorial, and I will quote from the conclusion.

Ms. Willey's story adds to the critical mass of allegations the President now faces. They need to be answered not by drips and drabs of "recovered memory" or fancy legal wordplay or a public presentation of all Ms. Willey's failings. They just need to be answered."

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would again remind the gentleman that those discussions are not appropriate at this time on the floor, pursuant to the rules of the House.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I appreciate the rule of the Chair, but I believe it is important, Mr. Speaker, that the American people take a look at the serious situation confronting the executive branch and confronting us all. In that spirit, Mr. Speaker, I would simply refer to some comments made in history by a distinguished member of the other party and its one-time Presidential nominee, Senator Hubert Humphrey of Minnesota, who nearly a quarter of a century ago on the NBC telecast Meet The Press, when discussing another

President confronting another difficult time, offered the advice that the President should answer the questions fully and completely, because the American people are forgiving people. It is in that spirit that I offer the same advice today, not for purposes of partisan tomfoolery, but because these questions cut to the very core of our constitutional Republic. Indeed, Mr. Speaker, it is difficult to rule or exercise moral leadership when there appears to be little moral authority.

So I offer these observations not to stand and offer contentions for the rules of the House, not to be provocative, but because the questions need answers. Mr. Speaker, in that vein, for the public good, not for partisan political points, I would simply ask this President, Mr. Speaker, to follow the advice that Hubert Humphrey offered nearly a quarter century ago. Because these issues transcend partisan politics, these issues need to be answered.

Mr. Speaker, I gladly yield my remaining time to my colleague the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. LATHAM).

TRIBUTE TO 185TH FIGHTER WING OF THE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

Mr. LATHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the men and women of the Air National Guard's 185th Fighter Wing based out of Sioux City, Iowa.

Last week, members of the 185th began a month-long deployment to Kuwait to assist in the enforcement of the no-fly zone over Iraq. Each member of the 185th that is participating in this mission has volunteered for this duty. This nationally recognized group of men and women are among the finest of America's defenders and Siouxlanders are very proud to be recognized as their home base.

The 185th exemplifies the importance of Guard and Reserve units throughout this country in ensuring the readiness of our Nation's national defense. They are men and women who unselfishly take time away from their families and their civilian roles in defense of freedom.

In addition to the members of the 185th, I would also like to recognize the family members of the men and women who serve in Guard and Reserve units. Many times, the difficulty of their sacrifices of time away from their loved ones is not properly acknowledged. I want those families to know that we are praying for a successful mission for the 185th and for the safe return home of their loved ones. Again, I want to say we are praying for their safe return from Kuwait.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12 of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m.

Accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 7 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess until 2 p.m.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Reverend James David Ford, D.D., offered the following prayer:

At a time when there are great opportunities to do the works of justice and to show deeds of kindness, we pray for the spiritual energy to do our work and to be of service to every person. We pray, O gracious God, for a strong faith and for the enthusiasm to translate that faith into action; we pray for wisdom so that we will have the discernment to make good decisions; we pray for a spirit of hope and for the everlasting yearnings we have for a better Nation and a world at peace. So on this new day, O God, we are grateful for your daily blessings and for your wondrous gifts of grace. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Chair's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to clause 5, rule I, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MARKEY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MARKEY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

ELECTION OF HON. RICHARD K. ARMEY AS SPEAKER PRO TEM- PORE ON TODAY

Mr. BOEHNER. Mr. Speaker, I offer a privileged resolution (H. Res. 386) electing the Honorable RICHARD K. ARMEY

of Texas to act as Speaker pro tempore, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

HOUSE RESOLUTION 386

Resolved, that the Honorable Richard K. Arme, a Representative from the State of Texas, be, and he is hereby, elected Speaker pro tempore on this day.

SEC. 2. The Clerk of the House shall notify the President and the Senate of the election of the Honorable Richard K. Arme as Speaker pro tempore during the absence of the Speaker.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SWEARING IN OF HON. RICHARD K. ARMEY AS SPEAKER PRO TEM- PORE DURING ABSENCE OF THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) come forward and take the oath of office.

Mr. ARMEY took the oath of office administered to him by the Speaker, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God.

PALESTINIAN WARNS SETTLERS

(Mr. PAPPAS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAPPAS. Mr. Speaker, in today's New York Times an article appeared entitled "Palestinian Warns Settlers," and it says that the Palestinian security chief in the West Bank warned Jewish settlers today that they would "not leave alive" if they tried to attack residents.

Mr. Speaker, we are in a very important time in the history of the State of Israel. Statements such as this certainly are not conducive to the peace process, and I certainly hope that in the future people in responsible positions such as this will not make these kinds of statements.

SLUSH FUND ACCOUNTABILITY

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, last year House Republicans created a \$7.9 million reserve fund for unanticipated committee expenses. They always anticipated, of course, spending the money. What they could not anticipate was which partisan witch-hunts they would use it for.

This cash stash is nothing but a slush fund for GOP priorities. Committees cook up schemes; if the Speaker approves, the Committee on House Oversight rubber stamps, and money flows. There is no floor debate, no vote, and no accountability. Millions have been disbursed this way, and Republicans are now scheming how to spend the \$4 million left in the fund.

I have introduced legislation, Mr. Speaker, requiring a House vote on future payouts from the slush fund. If Republicans want to waste public money on partisan witch-hunts, they should have to debate and vote in public.

The majority loves to talk about accountability. Let us see if they can put the slush fund where their mouth is.

CHILD SURVIVAL

(Mr. PITTS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the stories of a Kenyan doctor who describes the use of U.S. funded population control dollars in Africa. Dr. Stephen Karanja states, "Our health sector has collapsed. Thousands of Kenyan people will die of malaria whose treatment costs a few cents, in health facilities whose stores are stacked to the roof with millions of dollars worth of pills, IUDs, Norplant Depo-provera, most of which are supplied with American money."

He goes on to say, "Some of these contraceptives, like Depo-provera, cause terrible side effects to the poor people of Kenya, who do not even have competent medical check-ups before injection."

He continues, "A mother brought a child to me for pneumonia, but I had no penicillin to give the child. What I have in the stores are cases of contraceptives."

Colleagues, we should reexamine our spending priorities. We are overfunding family planning and underfunding child survival. We should focus our efforts on saving lives.

CARNAGE OF NAFTA GOES ON AND ON

(Mr. TRAFICANT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. TRAFICANT. Mr. Speaker, the carnage of NAFTA goes on. Thompson Electric is laying off a thousand workers and moving to Mexico. Bass Shoe Company is laying off 350 workers and moving to the Caribbean. Mitsubishi Electric is moving to Mexico. Matsui Battery is moving to Mexico. Kobe Steel is moving to Mexico. Sanyo Plastics is moving to Mexico. Divisions of Sony and Hitachi are moving to Mexico. Asahi Glass is moving to Mexico. And Fuji Electric is on their way to Mexico. And not to be left behind in

America, Samsung of Korea is moving to Mexico.

Free trade, my assets. The American worker is getting screwed, and Uncle Sam is passing out cigars. Beam me up. If this is free trade, then I am a fashion leader.

EVERY YEAR IS THE SAME; TAX TAKERS ASK FOR MORE AND MORE FROM TAXPAYERS

(Mr. BALLENGER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, as our country becomes increasingly divided between taxpayers and tax takers, the taxpayers are starting to stand up and tell their Representatives in Washington that America will no longer be the land of opportunity if the current trend continues.

Just this month, USA Today had on page 1 a chart showing the rising tax burden on the taxpayers. And the most interesting thing about the chart was that the tax burden has been rising steadily year after year for all families. It is rising for families with one income; it is rising for families with two incomes.

Funny how those who claim it is harder and harder for middle-class families to get ahead never seem to mention that one of the biggest reasons might be the rising tax burden. Funny how they never tire in opposing tax cuts on the grounds of fairness, and they never seem to consider the fairness towards the people who pay the taxes that Uncle Sam takes, between one-quarter and one-third of a middle-class family's income.

Every year it is the same old thing, tax takers ask for more and more from taxpayers, and every year the taxpayers sacrifice a little more freedom and find a little less opportunity in return.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The Chair reminds all persons in the gallery that they are here as guests of the House, and that any manifestation of approval or disapproval of proceedings is in violation of the rules of the House.

DEMOCRATS PROPOSE TO EXPAND MEDICARE COVERAGE FOR PEOPLE AGED 62 TO 64

(Ms. DELAURO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, today in my home State of Connecticut there are over 30,000 people ages 55 to 64 who are uninsured; 1 in every 10 individuals in this age group. That is simply unacceptable.

Democrats have a plan to help vulnerable uninsured Americans between the ages of 55 and 64 obtain health coverage under the Medicare program. The Democratic proposal would make it possible for those who are near retirement age not to be wiped out by an illness because they do not have health coverage. The program would expand Medicare coverage for people ages 62 to 64, and displaced workers over 55 whose employers renege on their promise of retiree health benefits. The program is self-financed and would not cost the Medicare Trust Fund one dime.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my Republican colleagues to stop sending us home and start scheduling action on important issues like Medicare expansion. This proposal would be a significant and an important step toward ensuring that those who are near retirement age would not be without health coverage if they had a serious illness.

CONGRESS MUST NOT RETURN TO THE FAILED POLICIES OF THE PAST

(Mr. GUTKNECHT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GUTKNECHT. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in a generation, Congress will spend less than it takes in this year. We should take this good news with a dose of caution. I am afraid that President Clinton has a different opinion. With surpluses in sight, he has decided that the era of saying "the era of big government is over" is over.

In his budget, the President proposes 85 new government initiatives costing \$150 billion over the next 5 years. He pays for these programs with \$129 billion in new taxes and user fees, raising taxes to their highest level since 1945. Even worse than that, the Clinton budget falls out of balance next year and breaks the spending caps of last summer's balanced budget agreement by \$69 billion.

The President's budget is built with higher taxes, deficit spending, bigger government and broken promises. My grandmother used to say, "If you always do what you have always done, you will always get what you have always got."

In 3 short years we have cut taxes, eliminated deficits and kept our promises. We must not now return to the failed policies of the past.

FRESHMAN CAMPAIGN FINANCE REFORM

(Mr. ALLEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, the Thompson report released last week has confirmed what we all know; that the integrity of our political system has been undermined by the influence of soft money.

The soft money loophole is the primary culprit for the abuses that Congress has spent millions of dollars to investigate. Through the soft money loophole, a single donor can give unlimited amounts of money to influence Federal elections. Soft money circumvents nearly a century of campaign finance law.

The bipartisan freshman task force set out to fix the major abuses of the current system. We put our differences aside and created a fair bipartisan campaign finance reform bill, H.R. 2183, the Bipartisan Campaign Integrity Act. It closes the soft money loophole, and it gets elected officials out of the business of raising \$1 million special interest contributions. It is fair. It is bipartisan.

Mr. Speaker, the freshman bill must be allowed to come to the House floor without any poison pills. An antilabor bill is not bipartisan reform, it is a poison pill, and poison pills are used to kill campaign finance reform. Mr. Speaker, the freshmen deserve a vote on H.R. 2183.

□ 1415

FIGHT FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM

(Mr. GIBBONS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIBBONS. Mr. Speaker, last week the Clinton administration gathered 40 lobbyists for a meeting at which the President urged them to publicly oppose our efforts to force changes in the current Tax Code by 2001. Realizing, of course, that working men and women in America are committed to idea of scrapping the current Tax Code, the President has now enlisted a group of spin doctors and Washington insiders to defend the status quo of our tax system.

Well, I have a better idea of how the President can spend his time. Instead of gathering D.C. lobbyists and spin masters, who make their living off the complexities of our Tax Code, the President should gather 40 hard-working taxpayers and let them voice their frustration and outrage over the Clinton system.

Mr. Speaker, the President would do well to simply listen to the horror stories from taxpayers about the abuse, intrusive and sometimes illegal acts committed by the IRS, rather than the lobbyists defending his Tax Code. Just such a meeting would convince the President to join rather than hinder our fight for comprehensive tax reform.

AMERICAN PEOPLE DESERVE TAX RELIEF

(Mr. JONES asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, today we are just 30 days away from the day of

the year that many Americans dread the most, and that is April 15th. April 15th, as we all know, is tax day. That means that, as we speak, families, businesses throughout the Nation are filing through mountains of documents, forms, rules and regulations; and they are frustrated.

I know my constituents in eastern North Carolina are frustrated, along with people throughout this Nation. My constituents tell me they are having real problems with our complex and burdensome Tax Code. Of course they are. Because they are currently facing 480 different tax forms, the easiest of which, the 1040 EZ, has 33 pages of instructions, all in fine print.

The American people want, need and deserve tax relief. Just ask anyone who is preparing for April 15th. We owe the American people tax relief. I hope that in a bipartisan way we can work together to provide them with a fair, simpler tax system.

STANDING UP FOR WHAT IS RIGHT AND DECENT IN AMERICA

(Mr. DUNCAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, Senator DANIEL PATRICK MOYNIHAN said 2 or 3 years ago that we have been "defining deviancy down, accepting as a part of life what we once found repugnant." How true that is, and it is especially true when it comes to what we have been accepting in motion pictures and even into our homes through television and now the Internet.

That is why it was so pleasant to read the nationwide publicity about the vote last week by the Town Council of Tangier Island, Virginia. The Tangier Council voted 6 to 0 to not allow a Kevin Costner and Paul Newman movie to be filmed on the island. The council decided that there was just too much obscene language and too many scenes of an adult nature.

We have been warping the minds of our young people, Mr. Speaker, with so much that is indecent that we have almost lost the ability to be shocked anymore. This Nation would be a far better place if we had more people standing up for what is right, decent and good, as the Tangier Council did last week.

EXTRADITION OF JOANNE CHESIMARD

(Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, 25 years ago Joanne Chesimard gunned down two State Troopers on the New Jersey Turnpike. After hitting Trooper Werner Foerster with two shots in the chest, Chesimard grabbed his gun and fired two more bullets execution-style into his head. Six years later, after serving just 2 years of a life sentence for first-degree

murder, she successfully broke out of prison.

Recently, I was shocked to turn on the evening news and see Joanne Chesimard a free woman, living the high life in Cuba. Fidel Castro is protecting this cold-blooded cop killer. There can and must be no safe haven for Joanne Chesimard.

Today, I am introducing a resolution which calls on the State Department to demand the extradition of Joanne Chesimard as a condition for any improvement in our relations with Cuba. I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. Insist that justice be served. Bring back Joanne Chesimard to the United States to spend the rest of her life behind bars.

HUMAN RIGHTS ABUSES IN CHINA

(Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LINDA SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, last Friday, for the first time since the Tiananmen Square massacre, the Clinton administration decided not to sponsor a U.N. resolution condemning China's terrible human rights record. Why? Because China just hinted that they may release a few dissidents.

Let me tell my colleagues, this is not progress. For the people who still toil in slave labor camps in China, this is not progress. This is not protecting the thousands of people that are put in prison and then have their vital organs harvested like animals. This is not progress. But this is an administration that says we will have a national policy of trade without a conscience.

I want to tell my colleagues, the Americans I know everywhere I have gone have a conscience. So today I really appreciate the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for having the courage to bring to the floor H.R. 364. This bill will send a strong message that America will not ignore the human rights abuses occurring each day in China or anywhere in the world.

U.N. GLOBAL CLIMATE ENVOY

(Mr. KNOLLENBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KNOLLENBERG. Mr. Speaker, on a day when we are all trying to be green, I found an article in today's paper that disturbed my festive mood. It seems the UN's Global Climate envoy was in Washington yesterday bad-mouthing the United States Congress because we are asking the questions that President Clinton is refusing to ask about the Global Climate Treaty agreed to in Kyoto. He said the U.S. should perhaps get more in touch with the rest of the world and that this Congress is acting as if the rest of the world does not exist.

Now the President may want to blindly follow the UN and their global

climate folies, but I and many others are not ready to send our jobs overseas and our economy into the tank because the UN says we should. And if this treaty is so great, then how come China, India, and Mexico are not willing to commit to emissions reductions? On a day when I hope to be green, I am blue.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the chair announces that he will postpone further proceedings today on each motion to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered or on which the vote is objected to under clause 4 of rule XV.

Such roll call votes, if postponed, will be taken after debate has concluded on all motions to suspend the rules but not before 5 p.m. today.

OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ADMINISTRATION COM- PLIANCE ASSISTANCE AUTHO- RIZATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2864) to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a program under which employers may consult with State officials respecting compliance with occupational safety and health requirements, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2864

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Occupational Safety and Health Administration Compliance Assistance Authorization Act of 1998".

SEC. 2. COMPLIANCE ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Section 21 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 is amended by adding at the end the following new subsection:

"(d)(1) The Secretary shall establish and support cooperative agreements with the States under which employers subject to this Act may consult with State personnel with respect to—

"(A) the application of occupational safety and health requirements under this Act or under State plans approved under section 18; and

"(B) voluntary efforts that employers may undertake to establish and maintain safe and healthful employment and places of employment.

Such agreements may provide, as a condition of receiving funds under such agreements, for contributions by States towards meeting the costs of such agreements.

"(2) Pursuant to such agreements the State shall provide on-site consultation at the employer's worksite to employers who request such assistance. The State may also provide other education and training programs for employers and employees in the State. The State shall ensure that on-site consultations conducted pursuant to such agreements include provision for the participation by employees.

"(3) Activities under this subsection shall be conducted independently of any enforcement activity. If an employer fails to take immediate action to eliminate employee exposure to an imminent danger identified in a consultation or fails to correct a serious hazard so identified within a reasonable time, a report shall be made to the appropriate enforcement authority for such action as is appropriate.

"(4) The Secretary shall, by regulation after notice and opportunity for comment, establish rules under which an employer—

"(A) which requests and undergoes an on-site consultative visit provided under this subsection,

"(B) which corrects the hazards that have been identified during the visit within the time frames established by the State and agrees to request a subsequent consultative visit if major changes in working conditions or work processes occur which introduce new hazards in the workplace, and

"(C) which is implementing procedures for regularly identifying and preventing hazards regulated under this Act and maintains appropriate involvement of, and training for, management and non-management employees in achieving safe and healthful working conditions,

may be exempt from an inspection (except an inspection requested under section 8(f) or an inspection to determine the cause of a workplace accident which resulted in the death of one or more employees or hospitalization for 3 or more employees) for a period of one year from the closing of the consultative visit.

"(5) A State shall provide worksite consultations under paragraph (2) at the request of an employer. Priority in scheduling such consultations shall be assigned to requests from small businesses which are in higher hazard industries or have the most hazardous conditions at issue in the request."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2864 will amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act to provide specific statutory authorization and direction for consultation programs operated by States with the assistance of Federal funding and direction.

These programs have in fact been operating for over 20 years. In 1975, OSHA began entering into contracts with the States to provide enforcement consultations for small businesses. The authority which OSHA used for these contracts is the general contracting authority in section 7C(1) of the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

In recent years the small business community, State consultation programs and the Clinton administration have all supported amending the Occupational Safety and Health Act to add a specific authorization and direction for the on-site consultation programs. So I am pleased to be able to bring this bill to the House, with bipartisan support in our committee. And with the support of the Clinton administration.

I want to particularly thank the ranking member of the Subcommittee

on Workforce Protections, Mr. OWENS, and the ranking member of the full committee, Mr. CLAY, for their willingness to work with us on this bill as well as the following bill. And also I want to thank Secretary of Labor Alexis Herman and Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, Charles Jeffress, for their support of these bills.

Mr. Speaker, the consultation program allows employers, particularly small employers, with the opportunity to receive expert advice and compliance with OSHA standards and improving safety and health in their workplaces, without the adversarial temper and approach often associated with OSHA enforcement inspections.

I believe this program truly does implement the approach to safety and health which many of us have long supported: an OSHA program that offers assistance, rather than merely the threat of enforcement, to employers.

I have often said that it seems wrong to me that employers who want to improve their workplaces are afraid to call OSHA and ask for assistance. The consultation program is one program that allows and encourages employers to call OSHA and to get that assistance.

My own company in North Carolina has used the North Carolina OSHA consultation program; and, in fact, it was our experience with that North Carolina program that triggered my introduction of H.R. 2864. Under this program, an employer invites the OSHA consultation service into the workplace, and the consultant works with the employer in identifying any violations of OSHA standards and hazards.

If the employer fixes those items within a reasonable time, then there is no enforcement action connected to it. Under H.R. 2864, an employer who meets certain listed criteria may also be exempt from some inspections for 1 year.

I believe the program fills a real need. Unfortunately, it has not been well enough known, nor has it received enough funding, to fulfill that need. So I hope that recognizing the program in this statute is the first step in making it more widely known and increasing in its availability.

This bill along with the following bill are small but I think significant steps in bringing about change to the way in which OSHA carries out the role of protecting and promoting worker safety and health.

Again, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) for working out the legislation. Even though we were basically following the current program, there were still a few issues that we had to resolve, and I appreciate his willingness to do so.

It is my hope that with the bipartisan effort and support for these bills that the Senate will move quickly and cleanly as well. There are a lot of other issues related to OSHA that we need to plan and deal with, but I hope that

these bills do not become entangled in other issues.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my appreciation to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), Chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, for his willingness to work with me on this legislation. I believe the bill before us will further the safety and health of workers, and I am pleased to support its passage.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), Chairman of the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Mr. GOODLING. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to express my support for the two bills amending the Occupation Safety and Health Act that are on the suspension calendar today.

I want to particularly commend the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protection, for his work on these bills and for his leadership on matters related to OSHA.

Also, I want to commend the gentleman from North Carolina along with the gentleman from New York, the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protection, for being able to bring not one but two bills dealing with OSHA to the floor with bipartisan support.

I would note that both bills are supported by the Clinton administration as well as by the National Federation of Business, the Chamber of Congress and the Coalition on Occupational Safety and Health and other organizations. That is a rather remarkable convergence of support, particularly for bills amending the Occupational Safety and Health Act.

Mr. Speaker, these two bills are small but important steps in bringing about change to the way OSHA carries out its role in protecting worker safety and health. They help move OSHA towards a more cooperative, less confrontational approach.

H.R. 2864 requires OSHA to provide work-site consultations to employers, particularly small employers, who request the consultation. These consultations will be provided through State agencies or public colleges or universities.

H.R. 2864 in effect codifies the consultation program from OSHA that began in the 1970s and which has provided thousands of small businesses with expert advice and assistance in providing a safer workplace for their employees and compliance with OSHA standards.

I know that in my own State, the consultation program has been ex-

tremely effective in reaching out to small businesses and working with them to improve safety and health. The biggest problem with the program has been lack of resources; and we hope that, by specifically recognizing consultation services in the statute, that we will bring additional recognition and resources to the program.

□ 1430

H.R. 2877 prohibits OSHA from using enforcement measures such as number of citations issued or penalties assessed to evaluate OSHA inspectors. It addresses the reality as well as the perception that OSHA inspectors often care less about worker safety than meeting quotas for citations and penalties. The former director of OSHA has acknowledged that past policy of the agency was in fact to use numbers of citations issued and penalties assessed as performance measures. As a matter of official policy, OSHA says it no longer uses these as performance measures. H.R. 2877 makes this policy permanent and also reflects our intention that OSHA's primary focus is not issuing citations and levying fines, but rather promoting safety and health for all American workers.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KLINK).

Mr. KLINK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I cannot tell my colleagues how pleased I am that this legislation, in fact both bills that come to the floor today are here. I want to commend and thank my former colleagues on the Committee on Education for this legislation, especially the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS). As far back as I remember when I had the pleasure and honor and distinction of serving on this committee back in the 103rd Congress, we wrangled with the whole idea of OSHA reform. We did not quite get the whole OSHA reform package together, but I am very pleased that the committee now has moved this bill and the bill to come after this that really make common sense bipartisan changes to the OSHA Act. This committee and the House really do themselves proud when they act in a common sense, bipartisan fashion to correct these issues.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2864 is good legislation, it follows the old adage that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. This bill will authorize OSHA's compliance assistance program, which has been in operation since the mid-1970s and for 23 years it has been working well. I think we should not only be authorizing this program, but expanding it because this program would help companies avoid problems with OSHA and at the same time make the workplace safer for workers.

An employer can ask a State consultant to review their work site for OSHA

violations as long as the employer agrees to correct any hazards. Even better, a company that participates in the compliance assistance program then can be exempted from regular OSHA inspections for a year if they implement hazard prevention procedures and provide for safety training for management and for employees. I wish that more companies had the ability to take advantage of this.

One such plant in my district was recently visited in a random OSHA inspection. I do not know if this bill would have helped them or not and I do not know if the person who visited from OSHA was on a quota, but what ended up happening is a lot of picayune things were found, the company was fined \$10,000, called Rijnstaal USA, and they are owned by a foreign entity. Now the foreign entity is taking a look at perhaps moving this plant out of Arnold, Pennsylvania to Southeast Asia because they think that OSHA has been picking on them, that they have not had an opportunity to go in and correct some of these small problems. In a case like that, who would win? Certainly the Federal Government would not win, we would get less tax dollars, less of our people would be working and paying dollars. Jobs and opportunities are lost to the community. Taxpayers lose. The employees of this company would lose. The only people that would gain would be whatever region of Southeast Asia would get this company.

We must take a more common sense approach, and these two bills today really begin to do that. My colleagues on the committee are to be lauded for their efforts. Mr. Speaker, I think this bill is a fine example of both labor-management cooperation and bipartisan legislating. I urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2864, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

AMENDING OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY AND HEALTH ACT OF 1970

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2877) to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H.R. 2877

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. INSPECTIONS.

Section 8 of the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970 (29 U.S.C. 657) is amended by adding at the end the following:

"(h) The Secretary shall not use the results of enforcement activities, such as the number of citations issued or penalties assessed, to evaluate employees directly involved in enforcement activities under this Act or to impose quotas or goals with regard to the results of such activities."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER).

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 2877 amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act to prohibit the use of enforcement measures, such as numbers of citations and penalties, for evaluating OSHA compliance officers.

Mr. Speaker, few other Federal agencies have had the negative reputation among employers, hardly ever anybody with the reputation of OSHA. There are certainly those who would say that this attitude simply reflects the employer's lack of concern for the health and safety of their employees. As a businessman, I do not believe that myself. Instead, I think the problem has been with OSHA. I would note my agreement with the statement made by Vice President GORE that he made to hundreds of small business owners and representatives in 1995 at the White House Conference on Small Business, where he said,

I know that OSHA has been the subject of more small business complaints than any other agency. And I know that it is not because you don't care about keeping your workers safe. It is because the rules are too rigid and the inspections are often adversarial.

I would add one more reason to those stated by the Vice President: OSHA's longtime practice of evaluating its overall performance and the performance of its compliance personnel, the only people from OSHA that most employers and employees ever actually deal with, primarily on the basis of their enforcement numbers. Employers are justifiably outraged and resentful of an agency when its inspectors are primarily interested in finding violations so that they look good to their superiors.

A couple of years ago the deputy administrator of OSHA who had spent his career with the agency made the observation that

OSHA for the past 25 years has basically done business the same way. Congress gave us the money and we gave them the inspections. We finally realized that the number of inspections doesn't change the behavior of anyone and listened to employers who complained that the violations OSHA cited didn't relate to illness and injuries.

I might add that that realization by OSHA came about the same time that we in Congress began trying to refocus

OSHA away from enforcement as its primary purpose and goal. Today we take a small step toward correcting history and the practice of OSHA. H.R. 2877 amends the Occupational Safety and Health Act to prohibit the use of enforcement measures, such as number of citations or amount of penalties, to evaluate OSHA personnel. It also prohibits the use of such enforcement measures as goals or quotas. More broadly, this bill is intended to direct OSHA's focus towards promoting safety rather than viewing its goal and purpose as penalizing employers.

I want to express again my appreciation to the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS), the ranking member of the subcommittee, and the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY), the ranking member of the full committee, as well as the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. GOODLING), the chairman, for their support of this bill, and also to the Secretary of Labor and the Assistant Secretary for Occupational Safety and Health, who have also expressed support for this bill.

As I noted earlier, the problem of evaluating OSHA personnel by the number of citations issued has not been confined to either Republican or Democrat administrations. It did, however, become particularly obvious when the Clinton administration in its first 2 years set agencywide goals of increased citations and penalties. Inspectors openly spoke to employees about having to issue citations in order to meet their quotas. I think few actions have undercut the agency's credibility as a safety and health agency more than that. To its credit the Clinton administration has taken steps to reverse this course. The previous and current administrators of OSHA have taken steps to remove the most blatant uses of citations and penalties to evaluate employees. Officially citations and penalties are no longer used as a performance measure. This was one of the steps taken as part of OSHA's reinvention by the Clinton administration. I certainly think it is a step in the right direction and one that I strongly supported. Nonetheless, we continue to hear complaints both from employers and from compliance personnel.

Just recently, for example, compliance officers in one region were given benchmarks by which their performance was judged. Those benchmarks included such things as numbers of citations per inspection and percentage of serious versus nonserious violations. This legislation is needed for several reasons: first, to make sure that the current official policy of the agency is continued; second, to make clear to everyone throughout OSHA that the use of enforcement measures to evaluate compliance personnel is not permitted; third, to assure not only OSHA personnel but also employers and employees that OSHA's primary purpose is not citing and fining employers but in promoting safer jobs.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, again I want to thank the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER), the chairman of the Subcommittee on Workforce Protections, for his willingness to work with me on this legislation. I fully concur in the gentleman's view that OSHA should not adopt work performance measures that can serve to bias the inspection process. The Clinton administration also strongly shares this view.

I do want to take this time to congratulate the administration and the workers at OSHA. There are few agencies that have such life and death responsibilities as OSHA. We must remember that last year more than 6,000 workers died on the job and nearly 60,000 were injured on the job. The work at OSHA remains very important and will go on. I think we should understand the difficulties that the OSHA inspectors face in respect to the inconvenience of employers versus the protection of the health and safety of employees. I therefore support H.R. 2877 and urge its adoption.

Mr. ROEMER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to voice my support today for H.R. 2877 and H.R. 2864. Both of these are encouraging examples of meaningful bipartisan reform that are enabling the agency to move from an adversarial relationship with employers to a cooperative one.

The common sense changes in H.R. 2877 assure that inspectors do not have to ever exaggerate the number or severity of violations they might find in work site inspections. It does so without compromising the safety of workers and without losing managerial control of the agency.

H.R. 2864 works to partner state consultation programs with businesses who seek advice on OSHA compliance. It is a great example of how OSHA can proactively cooperate with employers to correct problems without unnecessary fines before they cause injury or cost a life. It also focuses on small businesses in hazardous industries that may not be able to afford full-time safety managers or expensive consultants.

In the spirit of these effective and bipartisan measures, I plan on introducing a bill that helps solve a problem that some employers are having maintaining their Material Safety Data Sheets as mandated by OSHA. By allowing electronic access to these records, standardizing the format, and setting a comprehensible reading level, I hope to increase worker safety while lowering costs and headaches for small businessmen.

Again, these are excellent bills, and I wish to offer my utmost support. I encourage my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 2877. "Safety First," is a catchphrase known to many of us. Although, often disregarded, the virtue and benefits of this policy are universally recognized, accepted and appreciated. The concept of safety has attracted so huge a following that eventually it was decided that everyone should follow and live by its precepts. Later, we even came up with legal definitions. However, as most well-meaning folks have done before, we may have gone overboard by selectively imposing

this concept and designating some a few unfortunate entities to suffer the consequences for everyone. A scheme was even devised so that we can collect money from those who deviated from our mandates. This bring us to question whether safety is really the first priority.

H.R. 2877 prohibits the Labor Department and the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) from using results of enforcement activity, such as numbers of citations issued and penalties assessed, to evaluate employees directly involved in OSHA enforcement activities. In addition, this bill would prohibit OSHA from imposing quotas or goals for citations or penalties on its inspectors.

Coming from the island of Guam, I am no stranger to complaints of unfair treatment by Federal officials. OSHA issues have generated their fair share of attention on the island. Contractors of Guam feel that they are being singled out by OSHA inspectors. Figures show that 85% to 90% of the Administration's inspection resources for our region was spent on Guam although we had the lowest fatality rates and some of the lowest injury rates of Region IX.

Consistency in OSHA's definitions also come to question. OSHA has stated that increased inspection activity in our area is due to the presence of high hazard industries. However, nowhere else are labor camps listed as high hazard industries. Innovative programs and approaches such as Voluntary Programs and "Quick Fix" Programs have not been made available to Guam. It has also been brought to my attention that as of May 1997, OSHA Enforcement officers have been stripped of all authority except to conduct selected inspections.

H.R. 2877's provisions would not solve all of the world's problems. However, if OSHA's inspectors do not have to worry about quotas, we can greatly reduce unfair citations and fines. Safety first; fines only if necessary; and quotas . . . quotas are not at all necessary. I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 2877.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BALLENGER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 2877, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BALLENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H.R. 2864 and on H.R. 2877.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from North Carolina?

There was no objection.

AUTHORIZING USE OF CAPITOL GROUNDS FOR BREAST CANCER SURVIVORS EVENT

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 238) authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a breast cancer survivors event sponsored by the National Race for the Cure, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 238

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. AUTHORIZATION OF BREAST CANCER SURVIVORS EVENT ON CAPITOL GROUNDS.

The National Race for the Cure (referred to in this resolution as the "Race") may sponsor a public event on the Capitol Grounds on April 1, 1998, or on such other date as the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President pro tempore of the Senate may jointly designate.

SEC. 2. CONDITIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The event to be carried out under this resolution shall be—

(1) free of admission charge to the public; and

(2) arranged not to interfere with the needs of Congress and under conditions to be prescribed by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

(b) RESPONSIBILITY.—The Race shall assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities incident to all activities associated with the event.

SEC. 3. STRUCTURES AND EQUIPMENT.

For the purposes of this resolution, the Race may erect upon the Capitol Grounds, subject to the approval of the Architect of the Capitol, such stage, sound amplification devices, commemorative pink ribbon, and other related structures and equipment as may be required for the event to be carried out under this resolution.

SEC. 4. ADDITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS.

The Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board may make any such additional arrangements that may be required to carry out the event under this resolution.

SEC. 5. APPLICABILITY OF PROHIBITIONS.

Nothing in this resolution may be construed to waive the applicability of the prohibitions established by section 4 of the Act of July 31, 1946 (Chapter 707; 60 Stat. 718), concerning sales, displays, and solicitations on the Capitol Grounds.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM) and the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM).

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 238, as amended, authorizes the use of the Capitol Grounds by the National Race for the Cure to host an event on the morning of Wednesday, April 1, 1998. This event is a tribute to breast cancer survivors and will be free of charge and open to the public. Furthermore, it will not interfere with the needs of Congress.

This Survivors Day event is intended to raise the awareness of breast cancer and emphasize the importance of education and early detection on a na-

tional level. The sponsor will assume full responsibility for all expenses and liabilities relating to the event.

□ 1445

In addition, all of the arrangements will be overseen by the Architect of the Capitol and the Capitol Police Board.

The sponsor intends to erect a stage and a 50- to 75-foot pink ribbon, the commemorative symbol of breast cancer awareness, and sound amplification equipment.

In addition, in order to satisfy the concerns regarding fund-raising activities, the amendment clarifies that this event will not involve any fund-raising activities, as this is a prohibited use of the Capitol grounds pursuant to title 40, section 193 of the United States Code.

Mr. Speaker, breast cancer strikes 1 out of 8 American women and is the leading cause of death for women between the ages of 35 and 54. Early detection is known to provide the best chances of survival from this disease. This event will lend support to all survivors of breast cancer and demonstrate our commitment to the complete eradication of the disease.

In conclusion, I wish to congratulate the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), the Chairman of the Committee on Rules who sponsored this resolution, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN), whose wife Tamra is a private organizer of this event.

I support this resolution and urge my colleagues to support it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON).

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. They are waiting upstairs for a quorum, and I have to get back up there.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Senator CONNIE MACK, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN) and myself, I introduced House Concurrent Resolution 238. I want to say what an honor and privilege it has been to work with the distinguished Senator from Florida, CONNIE MACK, and his wife Priscilla on this very, very important initiative.

I want to thank the Chairman of the Subcommittee on Public Buildings and Economic Development, the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM), and of course the ranking member, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR), my good friend, as well for the opportunity to speak on this issue here this morning.

Mr. Speaker, this is a humble resolution. It simply authorizes the use of the Capitol grounds for an event on April 1st which will honor breast cancer survivors sponsored by the nationally recognized Race for the Cure.

Mr. Speaker, the statistics are staggering. Breast cancer strikes 1 in 8 women, as my good friend, the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM) has said, and is the leading cause of death

for women between the ages of 20 and 54. Today, there are 2.6 million women living with breast cancer in the United States. No woman is immune from the disease, and sadly, over 180,000 new cases will be diagnosed this year alone. In my home State of New York, nearly 14,000 women will be diagnosed with breast cancer this year.

Mr. Speaker, early detection is the key to winning the battle against breast cancer. We now know that regular mammography screenings with prompt treatment could result in one-third fewer deaths. The bad news is that only one-third of women follow the recommended screening guidelines.

That is why we are here today, to authorize the use of the Capitol grounds to highlight the importance of education and early detection on a national level by celebrating survivors of breast cancer and enhancing public awareness of this devastating disease.

Mr. Speaker, life is an incredible gift, and having survived a battle against cancer myself on 2 occasions in the past 4 years, I just want to urge everyone to come over here and pay tribute to these women and pass this bill today.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I am obviously very strong in support of the pending resolution, and I thank the Chair of the subcommittee for moving this legislation through so expeditiously, and the Chairman of the Committee on Rules for his very thoughtful words in support of an issue that is very special to me.

Mr. Speaker, I bring a personal perspective as well as a legislative perspective to this issue. The nationally established Race for the Cure has done an enormous amount of good in education and in publicizing an issue nationally that until the early 1980s was one that sort of stood in the closet. Until that time, it was difficult for most people to say in a public setting the word breast, and then to associate it with cancer. But along about the early 1980s, this disease came to be of epidemic proportions.

The Race for the Cure has brought this issue home to people of all walks of life all across the country, educating women to the need for self-examination, regular visits with a physician, regular mammographies for women of certain age, for women with a family history of breast cancer, for women with a family history of breast cancer and whose first child was born after the age of 30. And as women became better informed, as the terms entered our national lexicon, there have been enormous benefits. The Race for the Cure has raised dollars for cancer research, but more importantly, it has raised consciousness and awareness and the information level and the understanding level.

When my wife Jo detected the lump in her breast and it was confirmed as malignant, and she had a mastectomy, followed by chemotherapy. The issue

crashed in upon the Oberstar family. I was serving on the Committee on the Budget at the time, and I, for the first time, must shamefully admit, took a look at the number for breast cancer research. It was \$35 million in 1983. It is now well over \$500 million. I am pleased to say that I have had some role in moving it along in that direction, but there were lots of others who participated and made it happen.

In the 8 years that Jo struggled with breast cancer, the ups and downs, the pain of treatment, the pain that our children felt as they lost the participation of their mother to an ever-increasing level of inability to function fully as a human being, but still with a great heart, with enormous love and great support for the children, to the degree that she could, in that period of 8 years, 300,000 women died of breast cancer.

Annually, more women died in the 1980s of breast cancer than men and women died in the Vietnam War over 10 years. In the decade since the second round of onset of spread and metastasis of that disease in her body, 420,000 women have died of breast cancer.

Research has been effective in opening new avenues of treatment, much earlier detection, much better treatment and care of breast cancer victims, but we are still a long way, we are not even halfway home; we are a long way from even seeing avenues to a cure, let alone truly effective treatments.

The work that we do and activities like Race for the Cure does do something of extreme importance, and that is to bring home to women the importance of early detection, regular check-ups. The earlier one detects the disease, the better chance one has of surviving.

Our three daughters understand this all very well. Their mother had breast cancer; their grandmother had breast cancer. They are at some level of risk. But they have more at their disposal than their mother had. They know how early this disease can strike. They know that they need regular checkups. They know how quickly to act, and we want that kind of information brought home to women all across America. And the Race for the Cure is a way to do that.

No longer should generations of mothers, cornerstone of humanity, worry, wonder, live in fear, sometimes terrifying fear, that they, too, may become victims.

I applaud those who have organized in State after State across the country the Race for the Cure with the contribution they are making to future generations of women who can live more hopefully than did women of my wife's generation. The race may not be for a cure, but it has that objective in mind, and we must keep hope alive and keep research going and keep early detection and treatment nurtured by the benefits of this initiative.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me. The gentleman has spoken movingly of his own personal experience, one that I remember when it occurred. In doing so, I think he speaks for many Members of this House, who in one fashion or another have had family members to experience this disease. And in this respect, Mr. Speaker, I think that the Members of this House are truly representative of the American people, because this frightening disease is one that knows no group of any kind and is spread throughout the society. So it makes great sense that on the people's grounds we would grant an exception and allow a tribute to be held here in connection with the Race for the Cure.

So I strongly support this resolution that would allow the use of the Capitol grounds for the so-called Capitol tribute to breast cancer survivors, and I do so in two capacities, or perhaps three, not only as a member of Congress, but as the cochair of the Congressional Women's Caucus, 50 Members strong, who all of us across party lines strongly support this resolution, and, of course, as the Member representing the Nation's Capital, which is proud and pleased to have this tribute take place in this city.

I support this resolution for a special reason. I believe these events have made a tremendous difference. The gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. OBERSTAR) spoke about the need to raise consciousness. It is raising awareness that is saving lives. It is raising awareness that has sent women of every racial group and income group in huge numbers now to take advantage of mammography.

What is most encouraging to me is to see how mammography has spread across all the discernible lines, and that could simply not have happened except for a very much elevated consciousness. We would not have poor women and women of color going to get their mammograms by the hundreds of thousands as we do today were it not for events like this that did perform the simple agent of raising consciousness.

The Women's Caucus takes special note of this resolution and especially supports it. Breast cancer was long an underfunded disease spreading at frightening rates throughout our society, and the Women's Caucus years ago took it as its own special mission and obligation to see to it that funding was increased for the eradication of breast cancer.

□ 1500

Funding matters and raising consciousness matters. I think we see that in the figures that were reported on March 13, that in the first 5 years of the 1990s the annual number of new cases for cancer of all kinds fell steadily, and this happened among men and

women of all ethnic groups and most age groups.

I was particularly heartened that this downward trend for cancer was noted among several specific kinds of cancer: lung, prostate, colon or rectal and, yes, breast cancer.

This is, of course, as we might imagine, Mr. Speaker, the most frightening form of cancer for women. Perhaps it is not the most devastating, but it just as well may be, because it attacks the mind and the spirit with special viciousness, even as it is attacking the body.

Among women, breast cancer has declined for whites, and it has declined for Asians and for Hispanics. But during those years, 1990 to 1995, it rose for blacks. This rise for one group and the continuing numbers of women who get breast cancer of course takes away from the very hopeful statistics that are beginning to be reported. Breast cancer is the second leading cause of cancer deaths to American women, second only to lung cancer. It is the leading cause of cancer death among women ages 40 to 55.

Mr. Speaker, those are the ages when women are finally done with child-rearing, can come forward and blossom fully; and to have cancer occur at those prime years is simply intolerable. Even with the more hopeful statistics, even with the access to mammograms we now see across all groups in the society, 44,000 women died from breast cancer in 1997 and 180,000 new cases of the disease were diagnosed. We can do much better than that. We can do better than that not so much by curing cancer with some magic potion but by preventing cancer and by detecting cancer early with mammograms.

I greet this activity on the part of the Race for the Cure. I think it is most appropriate for the Congress to show its special concern beyond our funding, beyond the leadership of the Women's Caucus, by opening up this place, these grounds, for this special tribute. The Race for the Cure is a joyful event. There will be many breast cancer survivors participating, but it must remind us that the Race for the Cure is still a race to be won.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), Chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this measure. The National Race for the Cure has had a major impact upon our Nation. Last year, as I recall, there was a postage stamp dedicated to the Race for the Cure, just to emphasize how important this national program is. It raises millions and millions of dollars each year, and there is no better place to show leadership for the national Race for the Cure than here in our Nation's capital.

I know many of our congressional spouses, including my own, are very actively involved in the National Race for the Cure, because they feel very strongly about the impact upon women. It is for that reason I am pleased to rise in support of this measure, and I hope our colleagues give it full support.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, from time to time I have raised questions about various events proposed for the Capitol grounds, some of which I have thought were inappropriate or limited to a very narrow interest group. This event, the National Race for the Cure, to be held on April 1, is a broadly-inclusive event, one in which a wide range of people participate. It does not serve a special interest, it serves all interests. It is certainly in the category, in my classification, of those kinds of events that are appropriate for the grounds of our Nation's Capitol.

Mr. Speaker, the event that we will authorize by this resolution will, again, contribute to continued public understanding and awareness of breast cancer. I should mention, not only for women but also for men. While some 178,000 cases are expected by the National Cancer Institute to be diagnosed in women this year, also some 1,600 of breast cancer in men will be diagnosed this year. That is about an average number. It is much less a threat to men's health than breast cancer is to women's health, but it should be noted for the RECORD that men are not immune, either, from this dread disease.

While there has been an improvement in the detection rate, about a 4 percent decline in detection of breast cancers or incidents, I should say, of breast cancer, that is minuscule. It is a movement in the right direction, but it is minuscule. It shows how large the task is ahead of us.

Let us engage in this event, participate, give it our moral support, give it our physical support, not only here in the Nation's capital but throughout the country in our respective States, so that the greater awareness, the increased research that is undertaken year after year and focused on this disease will mean for future generations of young women that they will not have to wonder and worry about a fate that befell their mothers and grandmothers; that hopefully the day will come when there really is a cure and the race will be over.

Ms. MORELLA. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to rise in strong support of this bipartisan resolution authorizing the use of the Capitol Grounds for a Breast Cancer Survivors Event Sponsored by the National Race for the Cure.

While we have made progress in mounting an aggressive federal attack on breast cancer and the tragedy it causes, we still have far to go. Women continue to face a 1 in 8 chance of developing breast cancer during their lifetimes. It remains the most frequent major cancer in women and the second leading cause of cancer deaths among women. Last year, an

estimated 182,000 women were diagnosed with breast cancer and 46,000 died of the disease.

We must increase our investment in breast cancer research. We know very little about how to prevent the disease and treatment options are few. At least two-thirds of breast cancers occur in women with no known risk factors.

Just last weekend, I was honored to present a leadership award to Nancy Brinker, who established the Susan Komen Breast Cancer Foundation and who created the Race for the Cure. This event has become the nation's largest 5K series held in a record 86 cities throughout the United States in 1998.

It is most appropriate that this House approve the use of our nation's Capitol for this important event, and take this opportunity to redouble our efforts to eradicate breast cancer.

Mr. OBERSTAR. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. STEARNS). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. KIM) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 238, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the concurrent resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. KIM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on House Concurrent Resolution 238.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2870, TROPICAL FOREST CONSERVATION ACT OF 1998

Mr. SOLOMON (during consideration of H. Con. Res. 238), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 105-449) on the resolution (H. Res. 388) providing for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2870) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to facilitate protection of tropical forests through debt reduction with developing countries with tropical forests, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

URGING RESOLUTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res.

364) urging the introduction and passage of a resolution on the human rights situation in the People's Republic of China at the 54th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 364

Whereas the State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1997 state that "[t]he Government [of China] continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms," including extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, forced abortion and sterilization, the sale of organs from executed prisoners, and tight control over the exercise of the rights of freedom of speech, press, and religion;

Whereas, according to the State Department, "Serious human rights abuses persisted in minority areas [controlled by the Government of China], including Tibet and Xinjiang [East Turkestan], where tight controls on religion and other fundamental freedoms continued and, in some cases, intensified [during 1997]";

Whereas, according to the 1997 Country Reports, the Government of China enforces its "one-child policy" using coercive measures including severe fines of up to several times the annual income of the average resident of China and sometimes punishes nonpayment by destroying homes and confiscating personal property;

Whereas, according to the 1997 Country Reports, as part of the Chinese Government's continued attempts to expand state control of religion, "Police closed many 'underground' mosques, temples, and seminaries," and authorities "made strong efforts to crack down on the activities of the unapproved Catholic and Protestant churches" including the use of detention, arrest, and "reform-through-education" sentences;

Whereas, although the 1997 Country Reports note several "positive steps" by the Chinese Government such as signing the United Nations Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and allowing the United Nations Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to visit China, Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck has testified regarding those reports that "We do not see major changes [in the human rights situation in China]. We have not characterized China as having demonstrated major changes in the period over the course of the last year";

Whereas, in 1990, 1992, and each year since then, the United States has participated in an unsuccessful multilateral effort to gain passage of a United Nations Commission on Human Rights resolution addressing the human rights situation in China;

Whereas the Government of China has mounted a diplomatic campaign each year to defeat the resolution and has succeeded in blocking commission consideration of such a resolution each year except 1995, when the United States engaged in a more aggressive effort to promote the resolution;

Whereas China's opposition to the resolution has featured an attack on the principle of the universality of human rights, which the United States, China, and 169 other governments reaffirmed at the 1993 United Nations World Conference on Human Rights;

Whereas on February 23, 1998, the European Union (EU) agreed that neither the EU nor its member states would table or cosponsor a resolution on the human rights situation in China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights;

Whereas on March 13, 1998, the Administration announced that it would not seek passage of a resolution at the United Nations Commission on Human Rights addressing the human rights situation in China;

Whereas without United States leadership there is little possibility of success for that resolution;

Whereas, in 1994, when the President announced his decision to delink Most Favored Nation (MFN) status for China from previously announced human rights conditions, the Administration pledged that the United States would "step up its efforts, in cooperation with other states, to insist that the United Nations Human Rights Commission pass a resolution dealing with the serious human rights abuses in China" as part of the Administration's "new human rights strategy";

Whereas a failure vigorously to pursue the adoption of such a resolution would constitute an abandonment of an important component of the "expanded multilateral agenda" that the Administration promised as part of its "new human rights strategy" toward China; and

Whereas Chinese democracy advocate and former political prisoner Wei Jingsheng has stated that "[t]his [United Nations Commission on Human Rights] resolution is a matter of life and death for democratic reform in China"; Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) urges the President to reconsider his decision not to press for passage of a resolution on human rights violations in China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights;

(2) expresses its profound regret that the European Union will not table or cosponsor a resolution on human rights violations in China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights; and

(3) urges all members of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to support passage of a resolution on human rights violations in China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I urge every member of this body to support House Resolution 364. This strongly bipartisan resolution urges the introduction and passage of a resolution on human rights in the People's Republic of China at the 54th session of the U.N. Human Rights Commission which began yesterday and runs to the 24th of next month.

If any government deserves to be the subject of a U.N. Human Rights Commission resolution, the Beijing regime does. In its testimony before my subcommittee last month, Assistant Secretary of State John Shattuck made it very clear that "... the government of China continues to commit widespread and well-documented abuses in all areas of human rights." He also testified that there have not been any major improvements in that situation during the last year.

As detailed in the State Department's country reports on human rights practices in China, those abuses included extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, forced abortion and forced sterilization, the sale of organs from executed prisoners, and tight controls over religion, speech, and press. Persecution in some areas, such as the captive nations of Tibet and East Turkestan, even intensified during the past year.

House Resolution 364 merely urges the administration to reconsider and to do what it promised to do when it delinked MFN for China from human rights considerations in 1994: "... to insist that the U.N. Human Rights Commission pass a resolution dealing with the serious human rights abuses in China."

However, this past weekend, the administration signaled that it is backing away from that promise, just as it backed away from its previous promise to link China's MFN status to respect for human rights. In both cases, the retreat has not been justified by any improvement in the Chinese government's human rights record. As a matter of fact, it has gone backwards.

In explaining its decision not to seek a China resolution in Geneva, the administration has highlighted the PRC's recent announcement that it intended to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. However, that rationale does not justify the President's latest deference to the Beijing dictatorship for three basic reasons.

First, the Beijing regime regularly ignores its legal promises, especially where human rights are concerned. The Constitution of the PRC already guarantees freedom of speech, of the press, of assembly, of association, of procession, and of demonstration, as well as the freedom of religious belief and the freedom of ethnic minorities such as the Tibetans and Uyghurs from discrimination and oppression.

According to the administration's own reporting, the Beijing regime routinely and systematically violates those freedoms.

In a further example, China signed the U.N. Convention Against Torture over a decade ago; but according to the State Department, and other sources in human rights organizations, the Chinese government continues to use torture against prisoners each and every day. Thus, in return for its silence, the United States must demand real improvements, not paper promises.

Second, experience demonstrates that ratification of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights does not guarantee genuine respect for human rights. Many of the most abusive countries on the planet, including Iraq, North Korea, Nigeria, to name a few, are parties to that convention.

Third and most important, by using convention ratification as an excuse for the United States' inaction in Geneva, the administration has set up an

explicit double standard benefitting the Beijing regime.

Yet, last year alone, the administration supported seven U.N. Human Rights Commission resolutions concerning other countries that have signed the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights: Nigeria, Iran, Sudan, Iraq, Rwanda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Yugoslavia, and Equatorial Guinea.

The unprecedented favors shown to the Beijing dictatorship suggest that, in reality, the President's latest decision has little to do with the convention and everything to do with dollars and cents.

Wei Jingsheng, Mr. Speaker, the great Chinese democracy advocate and former prisoner of conscience, testified before my subcommittee just a few weeks ago. He said that a U.N. Human Rights Commission resolution at this time is a "matter of life or death" for the democratic reform in China.

Last week, in an open letter urging the U.S. to support a China resolution in Geneva, he explained that "the success of the Chinese government to silence the world community has serious consequences. It is a massive blow to the Chinese people's determination to struggle for human rights and democracy. They are left with the feeling that they are being betrayed."

Mr. Speaker, the President's decision this past weekend was, indeed, a betrayal, a betrayal of the countless Chinese, Tibetans, and others who suffer under the current regime, and a betrayal of our own democratic and humanitarian ideals.

The United States' support for a U.N. human rights resolution is the very least that we can do for the Chinese and the Tibetan peoples. If the U.S. will not raise human rights violations in a forum dedicated exclusively to human rights concerns, then where will we raise those issues and how can we expect tyrants to heed our admonitions in private when they know we will lack the will to speak about them in public?

□ 1515

Notwithstanding his announcement this weekend, Mr. Speaker, I urge the President, we urge collectively the President to honor his previous pledge to support a China resolution at the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva. In the meantime, I urge my colleagues to support passage of the resolution.

I. SUMMARY

China appears to be on the verge of ensuring that no attempt is made ever again to censure its human rights practices at the United Nations. It is an extraordinary feat of diplomacy and an equally extraordinary capitulation on the part of governments, particularly the United States and the countries of the European Union, that claim to favor multilateral initiatives as a way of exerting human rights pressure. One of the few remaining international fora to exert such pressure is the annual meeting of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights in Geneva—in session this year from March 10 to April 18—

where countries with particularly egregious human rights records can become the subject of resolutions. Every year save one since 1990, the U.S. and the E.U. have taken the lead, with support from Japan and other governments, in sponsoring a resolution on China, and every year save one, China has successfully blocked even debate on the subject. The threat of a resolution, however, has itself been an effective form of pressure, as illustrated by the time and resources China has spent in trying to counter it.

This report is an analysis of China's diplomatic efforts with respect to key members of the commission over the last three years. It describes a pattern of aggressive lobbying by Chinese officials, using economic and political blandishments, that has worked to undermine the political will in both developed and developing countries to hold Beijing accountable in Geneva, coupled with procrastination and passivity on the part of China's critics, the same governments that have been such vocal proponents of multilateralism.

The report suggests that countries concerned about human rights in China should put more, not less effort into a carefully constructed resolution at the U.N. Human Rights Commission; that the process of fashioning a resolution and lobbying for its passage is important, whether it ultimately reaches the floor of the commission for debate or not; and that ending all efforts on China at the U.N. Human Rights Commission, as the U.S. and Europe seem to be considering, will be seen in China as a triumph over the West's dominance of international institutions and one that it may want to follow up in fields other than human rights.

As this report went to press, the U.S. and the E.U. were involved in diplomatic negotiations with China on a possible package of limited steps or promises in exchange for dropping a resolution this year and in subsequent years. The U.S. in particular, seemed poised to accept any last-minute gestures that China might make during Vice President Albert Gore's trip to China in late March, midway through the commission's deliberations. But the prospect of obtaining truly meaningful improvements from Beijing on human rights would have been far higher had there been a real threat of a coordinated, high-level lobbying effort behind a resolution in Geneva, the work on which would have had to have begun in September or October 1996. For the U.S. and E.U. to suggest at this late date that a resolution cannot pass is a prophecy they have done their utmost to make self-fulfilling.

BACKGROUND

A resolution on China at the commission is a curiously potent tool for raising human rights issues, given that it is an unenforceable statement that carries no penalties or obligations. But as the product of the U.N., it has major implications for a country's international image, and even to table a resolution for discussion is considered by many countries, China among them, as a major loss of face. But China considers the U.N. Human Rights Commission an important forum for other reasons as well, including as a vehicle for countering Western "hegemonism," particularly through alliances with governments in Asia, Africa and Latin America. During the 1996 session of the commission, Chinese diplomats made clear that they saw an attempt to seek a resolution on China as an example of this hegemonism, arguing that the North used the commission as a one-way forum through which to confront, judge, and interfere in the internal affairs of developing countries while ignoring abuses in the U.S. and Europe, and that the commission paid too much atten-

tion to political and civil rights while neglecting economic, social, and cultural rights and the right to development.¹ In addition to its value to China as a forum to challenge the West, the commission has also become a useful vehicle to play the U.S. off against its erstwhile European allies.

Interest in using the U.N. Human Rights Commission as a forum for criticizing China only emerged after the crackdown in Tiananmen Square in 1989. Beginning in 1990, the annual Geneva meetings were marked by efforts to table mildly worded resolutions urging China to improve its human rights practices and criticizing ongoing violations of international standards. These efforts were defeated before the resolutions could come up for debate by "no-action" motions brought by one of China's friends on the commission—Pakistan could be counted on in this regard. A "no-action" motion, if passed, meant that the resolution died a quick death before ever coming to debate and vote.

In March 1995, however, the "no-action" motion failed for the first time. China's human rights record was debated, and a resolution sponsored by the U.S. and the European Union lost by only one vote when Russia unexpectedly cast its vote in opposition. It was the closest China had ever come to defeat. In April 1996, by contrast, China again successfully blocked a resolution through the "no-action" procedure, by a vote of twenty-seven to twenty with six abstentions. In the year that elapsed between the two meetings, China's human rights record had worsened, but its lobbying had improved and the political will of its critics had weakened.

Visits between China and commission members between April 1996 and March 1997 resulted in more aid packages, new and expanded trade contracts including foreign investment and joint ventures, and promises of improved bilateral cooperation on projects ranging from agriculture to nuclear technology. While it is impossible to definitively document the direct relationship between each visit or aid package and the votes of individual commission members, an overall pattern emerged that may help to explain China's success at muzzling the commission. Clearly, in many countries, much more was at stake than a Geneva vote, as Beijing sought to boost its long-term political and economic relationships and to weaken Taiwan's ties with some capitals. But a major objective during this period was also to defeat the annual Geneva effort.

In 1995 and in 1996, the importance of the outcome in Geneva was clearly reflected in official statements. At the conclusion of the 1995 voting, a foreign ministry spokesman speaking on state radio "expressed its [the Chinese government's] admiration and gratitude to those countries that supported China," and China's ambassador to the U.N. in Geneva said the resolution was "entirely a product of political confrontation practiced by the West with ulterior motives."² After the 1996 vote, an article by the official Chinese news agency Xinhua, entitled "Failure of Human Rights Resolution Hailed," gloated that the commission "has again shot down a draft resolution against China, marking another failure by the West to use human rights to interfere in China's internal affairs. . . ."³

From China's perspective, there were two relatively balanced voting blocs on the commission, and a number of crucial swing votes.⁴ One bloc consisted of Asian and African states. The second was composed of western Europe and North and Central America. The swing votes were to be found

¹Footnotes appear at end of report.

among some of the new democracies of central Europe, the former Soviet republics, large Latin American countries and a handful of African and Asian nations. China courted them all and pursued its efforts to divide Europe and the United States.

II. THE EUROPEAN UNION AND THE UNITED STATES

In 1995, the year the resolution lost by one vote, the U.S. and E.U., which together with Japan were the resolution's co-sponsors, began efforts to get other countries on board as early as December 1994, when then U.S. National Security Adviser Anthony Lake went to Zimbabwe, Gabon and Ethiopia. The Geneva resolution was one of the issues on his agenda. Geraldine Ferraro, then head of the U.S. delegation to the commission, made calls to Latin American capitals.

After that close call, Chinese diplomats and government officials seemed to intensify their efforts to underscore that good economic relations with the world's largest country would be fostered by decreasing pressure on human rights. Overt Chinese pressure, of course, was not always needed: European leaders were well aware that the competitive edge with the Americans could be widened if human rights criticism was left to the latter, especially when the U.S. was already preoccupied with a struggle with China over intellectual property rights and the annual debate over Most Favored Nation status.

The first attempts to derail a resolution on China at the 1996 U.N. Human Rights Commission session took place in Bangkok on March 1 and 2, 1996 when Chinese Premier Li Peng met with German Chancellor Helmut Kohl and French President Jacques Chirac at the E.U.-Asia summit. With a US\$2.1 billion Airbus contract hanging in the balance and a visit to France by Li Peng set for April, France took the lead in trying to work out a deal whereby in exchange for a few concessions from China, the E.U. and the U.S. would agree to drop the resolution. The nature of the proposed concessions was never made public but was rumored to include an agreement by China to sign and ratify the two major international human rights treaties, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights; the release of some political prisoners; and an invitation to U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights José Ayala Lasso, to visit China. Ratification without reservations would indeed have been a useful step, but when pressed to give a timetable for ratification, Beijing reportedly backed off, and the deal fell through. Italy—then in the presidency of the E.U.—was said to be leaning to the French deal, as was Germany, which with bilateral trade of \$18 billion, was China's largest trading partner in Europe and one of Europe's top investors in China. The Europeans did not come on board until ten days after the commission session opened, and then only reluctantly.

The resolution was doomed by a failure of will on the American side as well. The United States was no more eager than its European counterparts to earn China's opprobrium by sponsoring a resolution, and, according to one source, a deliberate decision was made within the Clinton administration sometime in December 1995 to give the resolution less attention than the year before, with the result that lobbying was late, desultory and ultimately unsuccessful.

Despite appeals on human rights in China and Tibet signed by over 200 French legislators and scattered protests, Li Peng's visit to Paris from April 9-13, just before the commission vote, was hailed by Beijing as marking a "watershed" in its ties with France. Li

Peng took the opportunity to finalize the Airbus sale in what appeared to be a deliberate slight to the U.S. government and the American company Boeing, hitherto the largest supplier of aircraft to China. In one reporter's words, China preferred to deal with countries that "don't lecture China about human rights, don't threaten sanctions for the piracy of music, videos and software and don't send their warships patrolling the Taiwan Straits."⁵

Li Peng's trip to Europe was followed in July 1996 by a six-nation swing by President Jiang Zemin through Europe and Asia, aimed at closing business deals and enhancing Jiang Zemin's international standing. An important side-effect, if not a deliberate objective of these visits, was to erode the willingness of some European countries to confront Beijing in Geneva. The trip came on the heels of a Chinese threat to impose economic sanctions on Germany in retaliation for a conference on Tibet. The conference was sponsored by the Friedrich Naumann Foundation, closely linked to Foreign Minister Klaus Kinkel's Free Democratic Party, and was to be held in Germany in June in cooperation with the Dalai Lama's government-in-exile. The row started over the German government's proposal to provide a subsidy for the conference. Under pressure, government funding was withdrawn, but the conference went ahead with the support of German politicians from all parties. The Chinese government then forced the closure of the foundation's Beijing office. In retaliation, German politicians introduced a motion in the Bundestag criticizing China's human rights record. China then withdrew an invitation to German Foreign Minister Kinkel to visit Beijing.

When Beijing further warned that German business interests in China could suffer, Bonn quickly scrambled to restore good relations. In September the invitation was renewed, and Kinkel went the following month. He did raise the cases of political prisoners Wang Dan and Wei Jingsheng, but the real story was that commercial relations with Germany were back on track, for in November in Beijing, President Jiang and German President Roman Herzog signed four agreements on financial and technological cooperation. The last quarter of 1996 saw multimillion dollar deals signed between China and Germany companies, including a joint venture by Mercedes Benz in Jiangsu province to produce buses; a joint venture by Kogel Trailer to produce specialized auto vehicles; a joint venture by Bayer AC and Shanghai Coating Company to produce iron oxide pigments; and a US\$6 billion investment in a petrochemical plant by German chemical company BASF.

China also wooed other European countries. In June, Chen Jinhua, head of China's State Planning Commission, visited Italy. In Milan, he held meeting with leading Italian financial and business interests, discussing how China's ninth five-year plan would lead to the continued open up of the economy to the outside world. Stressing the growth of bilateral trade, which stood at a record US\$ 5.18 billion in 1995, he noted China's potential as a huge market with possibilities for increased Sino-Italian cooperation. In September, Li Peng went to the Hague, just as the Netherlands was poised to take over leadership of the E.U.; in October Italian Foreign Minister Lamberto Dini led a group of Italian businessmen to Beijing on a "good will" visit; and in November, Li Peng was back in Europe on a visit to Rome, where he and his Italian counterpart pledged to encourage Sino-Italian economic and trade ties.

Britain also worked to bolster its trade with China. When Trade and Industry Sec-

retary Ian Lang met with Minister of Foreign Trade and Economic Development Wu Yi in Beijing in September 1996, they agreed to set up working groups in the chemical industry, aeronautics, and energy. In October, Li Lanning, a vice-premier and vice-chair of the State Council (the equivalent of China's cabinet), traveled to London to meet with Deputy Prime Minister Michael Heseltine, and in November, the two countries signed a Memorandum of Understanding on forming a Sino-U.K. Aerospace Equipment Working Group to promote commercial and technical cooperation in civil aviation.

III. LATIN AMERICA

Latin America was clearly a priority region for China if it was to defeat a resolution at the 1996 commission session. Next to Europe and North America, it was most likely to vote against China. In some cases, this was due to history of susceptibility to U.S. influence, in others to a democratic transition from an abusive authoritarian past that made the new democracies important allies in efforts to censure grave abuses wherever they occurred. Many Latin American countries, including Mexico, Brazil, Chile, Ecuador, Argentina, Peru and Venezuela, also had serious strains in their bilateral relations with China because of textile and garment "dumping" by the latter. Of all the countries in the region, only Cuba and Peru consistently voted with China in 1995 and 1996, Mexico, Colombia and Venezuela abstained in both years.

Top Chinese government and Party officials increased the exchange of visits with Latin America leaders after the near success of the 1995 resolution. In October 1995, Premier Li Peng went to Mexico and Peru, signing trade and cooperation agreements with both governments. Peru had abstained from all China votes at the commission until 1995 when it voted in favor of the no-action motion. As if to reinforce the relationship, Luo Gan, secretary-general of the State Council, went to Peru in March 1996 with the commission already in session and pledged US\$350,000 in aid and a loan of US\$70 million to be used toward China-Peru trade. The sums were small, but the symbolism of South-South aid was important. Peru again voted with China at the commission in 1996. That August, the speaker of the Peruvian parliament, visiting Beijing, said pointedly in the context of a discussion on human rights that his country did not interfere with China's internal affairs. High-level exchanges also took place in 1995 with Brazil, Chile, and Cuba.⁶

In June 1996, following the April vote in the Human Rights Commission, Wu Yi went on a month-long tour of seven Latin American countries, Argentina, Cuba, Mexico, Peru, Uruguay and Chile, all but Peru to be members of the commission for the coming year. In November 1996, Li Peng went back to Latin America, visiting two members of the commission whose voting records had been inconsistent, Brazil and Chile. Brazil was key. Until 1996, it had abstained on all votes on China, in April 1996, it voted against China's efforts to stop action on a resolution. Li Peng's delegation specifically raised the issue during the visit expressing unhappiness with the Brazilian vote, and officials at the Brazilian Ministry of Foreign Relations reportedly discussed the possibility of abstaining on a no-action motion in 1997. The Chinese premier's visit produced agreement on a consulate in Hong Kong after July 1, 1997, on peaceful use of space technology and on sustainable development initiatives. Trade issues were also on the agenda.

Chile had voted with China in 1992, then abstained on all votes until 1996 when it joined Brazil to vote against China's efforts

to stop debate. During his November visit, Li Peng announced tariff reductions of more than 10 percent on Chilean agricultural goods and signed agreements on scientific and technological cooperation in agricultural and aerospace. As with Peru, the substance of the agreements between Chile and China was less important than the political symbolism of Li Peng's visit, and as with Brazil, the Geneva vote was almost certainly on the agenda.

The presidents of Ecuador and Mexico and the foreign minister of Uruguay all visited Beijing between May and December 1996.⁷ Closer ties between China and Latin America, as indicated by high-level exchanges, underscored the fact that sponsors of a resolution critical of China could not take the votes of Latin American members of the commission for granted. They would have to undertake some sustained lobbying, and apparently they did not.

IV. AFRICA

If the U.S. and Europe and other sponsors of a resolution were serious about a multilateral initiative to exert pressure on China, it was essential that they bring some African members of the commission on board. Admittedly, it would not have been an easy task, given Chinese diplomatic initiatives and interests in the region, but save for some modest measures in 1994 like U.S. National Security Adviser Anthony Lake's discussions (see above), the sponsors put little energy into finding support from African governments.

China, on the other hand, was energetic. Since the end of the Cold War, it has seen African countries as critically important allies, particularly in the United Nations, in the struggle against American "hegemonism."⁸ With its history of colonialism and the fact that for the North, it had become the "forgotten continent," Africa has been viewed as a desirable partner in China's efforts to "bypass" the United States.⁹ In addition, China had a strong interest in stepping up its diplomacy in the region to counter Taiwan's aggressive campaign to expand ties with some African states.

China embarked on a concerted diplomatic campaign in Africa in mid-1995. Although the main objective may have been to blunt Taiwan's influence, it may not be coincidental that the campaign began after China lost a no-action motion and nearly lost the resolution in Geneva in March 1995, or that the countries singled out in this campaign were also for the most part members of the commission.

In October-November 1995, well before the 1996 session of the commission convened, Li Lanqing traveled to six central and western African countries: Mali, Guinea, Senegal, Gabon, Cameroon and Côte d'Ivoire. Of these, all but Senegal were members of the commission. In November, Quao Shi, a leading member of the Central Committee and chairman of Standing Committee of China's National People's Congress (China's parliament), went to Egypt, another key member of the commission. All the countries included in these two visits voted with China in the April 1996 "no-action" motion.

By contrast, from September 1995 to March 1996 there were few high-level exchanges between the U.S. and African members of the commission, and when they took place, China was not on the agenda. Angolan president Dos Santos made a state visit to Washington, D.C. on December 8, 1995, for example, but amid the many issues on the U.S.-Angolan agenda, support for a critical position in the U.N. toward China's human rights practices was reportedly not one Madeleine Albright, then U.S. ambassador to the U.N.

visited Angola in January 1996, but apparently made no effort to press for Angola's support at the Human Rights Commission. Angola ranks fourth among China's African trading partners and has consistently voted with China at the Human Rights Commission. If the U.S. was serious about generating international pressure on China through the U.N., its officials would have seen the visits by its officials as an opportunity to put multilateralism into practice and raise the issue of a resolution in Geneva.

Ethiopia, a key member of the commission, exchanged visits with European and American officials, with development assistance and security the main issues at stake. German President Herzog visited Ethiopia in January 1996, during which he signed an aid agreement for the purchase and transport of fertilizers, and Prime Minister Meles Zenawi spent two days in Paris, meeting with the French prime minister and with President Chirac. In neither case was there any indication that the China vote was on the agenda, and a source close to the U.S. delegation to Geneva told Human Rights Watch that no attempt was made to lobby Ethiopia for its vote.

China appeared to have stepped up its efforts to ensure a similar victory in the 1997 session. Following the end of the 1996 commission meeting in April, all fifteen African members of the commission sent or received high-ranking visitors from China. In May 1996, according to Chinese reports, President Jiang himself "crossed a thousand mountains and rivers to enhance friendship, deepen unity, and learn from the African people," visiting a total of six countries as he covered the continent "from North to South, from east to West." Of the six countries, four, Ethiopia, Egypt, Mali and Zimbabwe, were members or about to become members of the commission. At a meeting of the Organization of African States, Jiang stressed that China would be an ally in Africa's drive to develop; and, in fact, over twenty-three agreements and protocols on Sino-African cooperation were signed in May alone. They primarily provided for basic construction projects in transport and energy.¹⁰

During meetings in Beijing in May 1996, two days before he left for his African tour, President Jiang pledged economic and military support for Mozambique, which rotated on to the commission in time for the 1997 session, at the same time, Chinese Defense Minister Chi Haotian discussed details of the bilateral ties between the two nations' militaries and provided Mozambique with quantities of new weapons. Sino-Mozambican relations went into a tailspin in 1996 when China abruptly pulled out of an agreement to build a new parliament building. The visit in May was an effort to repair relations but it could also help produce a pro-China vote in the commission this March.

Jiang Zemin was present in Zimbabwe in May 1996 when Minister of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation Wu Yi signed agreements for US\$10 million in grants and an additional US\$10 million in loans, as well as other agreements on trade, reciprocal protection of investment and technological and economic cooperation. Earlier an agricultural group from China studied the possibilities of importing cotton and tobacco from Zimbabwe. In 1995, the first time Zimbabwe voted on a China resolution in Geneva, it voted for the no-action motion and against the China resolution; in 1996 it again voted in favor of no action on China.

Following Jiang Zemin's May 1996 visit to Mali, China signed agreements on economic and technological cooperation during meetings in Beijing between Premier Li Peng and Mali's president, and the Chinese vice-minister of agriculture signed an agreement to

assist Mali in building a number of factories. In 1996, when Mali voted on the China question for the first time, it voted in favor of the no-action motion.

Jiang Zemin also traveled to Ethiopia in May on a good will visit during which four cooperation agreements were signed. China-Ethiopian economic relations have been minimal compared with China's relationships with other African countries. Before Jiang's visit, Chinese journalists made much of an Ethiopian irrigation project completed with help from thirty-eight Chinese experts. In 1990, Ethiopia voted for the no-action motion and then went off the commission until 1995, when it voted in favor of the no-action motion but abstained when the resolution itself was voted on. In 1996 it again voted in favor of no action.

Algeria was already considered in the China camp. Jiang Zemin and the president of Algeria met in Beijing in October to discuss bilateral relations and to sign six documents including one protecting and encouraging reciprocal investment. Algeria has had a strong and continuous relationship with China which helped with a heavy water research reactor, and has been involved in irrigation, agricultural, and research projects including a three-star hotel in Algiers. In January 1997, Foreign Minister Qian Qichen paid a quick visit to Algeria, meeting with the foreign minister to discuss strengthening bilateral cooperation.

Uganda became a member of the commission in time to vote with China on the 1996 no-action motion. While the commission was still meeting in April 1996, Li Zhaoxin, China's vice-minister of foreign affairs, agreed to provide US\$3.6 million to cover the costs of a national stadium. In January 1997, at the request of the Ugandan government, China agreed to send technical personnel for two years to provide guidance in connection with the stadium project.

Li Peng and the president of Gabon, meeting in Beijing in August 1996, stressed the importance of their relationship and their support for the rights of developing nations. Gabon abstained in 1992 on a no-action motion but has since voted solidly in the Chinese camp.

When Chinese Vice Foreign Minister Tian Zengpei met with the Guinean Foreign Affairs Minister in Guinea in April while the commission meeting was still in session, he thanked him for Guinea's support on the human rights issue. Guinea, a new member of the commission as of the 1996 session, voted for no action on the China resolution.

During a visit to South Africa, China's largest trading partner in Africa, in May 1996, Wu Yi negotiated promises of expanded trade ties and reciprocal "most favored nation trading status." The importance of China to South Africa's economy was underscored in December 1996 when President Nelson Mandela abruptly abandoned diplomatic support for Taiwan and recognized Beijing as the sole representative of China.

Buho, the vice-chairman of the Standing Committee of the National People's Congress paid a goodwill visit to Benin in December 1996. Although Benin had voted with China in 1996, it abstained on both the no-action motion and the resolution itself in 1995.

Both the timing and the high-profile nature of most of these exchanges highlight the likely difficulties of getting African countries to abstain on a China resolution, let alone vote in favor, in 1997. If the U.S. and Europe had been committed to seeing a resolution pass, both would have had to have engaged in intensive lobbying beginning in late 1996.

V. CENTRAL AND EASTERN EUROPE

After March 1995, high-level Chinese officials logged considerable mileage traveling to

the Russian Federation and to two former Soviet republics, Belarus and the Ukraine. All three countries were to be 1996 commission members. Belarus for the first time, and the Ukraine for the first time since 1990.

In 1995, after Russia helped to defeat a no-action motion, its delegates switched their vote and the resolution itself failed as a result. It seemed logical in 1996, that if China were to avoid another near embarrassment, it would have to guarantee Russia's vote on the no-action motion itself. Not since 1990 had Russia voted to send a resolution to the floor. Furthermore, it was generally agreed that the Belarussian president, anxious for reunification with Russia, would vote with Russia. Of course China had other political and economic stakes in its relations with Central and Eastern Europe that may have been the driving force behind much of the activity outlined below; but with the Geneva vote so important to Beijing, lining up commission members was a likely factor.

In June 1995, Li Peng visited all three states. During his visit to Belarus, there was agreement on bilateral cooperation in trade, science, technology, manufacturing, and agriculture. In the Ukraine, he signed a note worth 8.5 million *renminbi* (approximately US\$1.7 million) in economic assistance. In August, as a follow-up to the June visits, the vice-minister of the Ministry of Foreign Trade and Economic Cooperation (MOFTEC) led a trade delegation to the region.

The direction of the visits reversed in September when the vice-prime minister of Russia went to Beijing, followed in November by a vice-minister from the Belarussian Ministry of Foreign Economic Relations, and in December by the Ukrainian president. During a meeting with Jiang Zemin, the two signed a joint communiqué furthering bilateral economic and political cooperation. In April 1996 while the Human Rights Commission was in session, Qiao Shi, chairman of Standing Committee on China's National People's Congress (parliament), traveled to Moscow to meet with top Russian officials in preparation for meetings later in the month with three central Asian republics. That same month, China exchanged ministerial visits with both Belarus and the Ukraine. At the invitation of Qian Qichen, the Belarussian foreign minister traveled to Beijing. During a meeting with Li Peng, he thanked him for China's support of Belarus on international issues and described as "encouraging" the 60 percent growth in bilateral trade in 1995. Qiao Shi traveled to the Ukraine for a four-day visit aimed at expanding cooperation between the two countries. Shipbuilding, aircraft manufacturing and instrument products were cited as industries for cooperation.

In the wake of all this activity, Russia abstained and Belarus and Ukraine voted with China in favor of no action on the resolution at the 1996 commission session. Two days after the vote, President Boris Yeltsin was warmly welcomed in Beijing by Jiang Zemin, Li Peng, and Qiao Shi. The major accomplishments of the meetings included an agreement signed by China, Russia, Kazakhstan, Tajikistan and Kyrgyzstan strengthening border confidence, a Sino-Russian joint communiqué to serve as "the principled basis for the two countries' constructive partnership during the 21st century"¹¹ and a dozen cooperation agreements, including ones on intellectual property rights, cooperation on the peaceful use of nuclear energy, and development for mutual prosperity. In addition, representatives from both countries discussed cooperation on military technologies. By December 1996, when Li Peng visited Moscow, plans were being laid for an April 1997 summit on security. At the same time, Russia agreed to lend China

US\$2.5 billion for nuclear power plant construction and to sell arms to Beijing. And Li and Viktor Chernomyrdin discussed raising bilateral trade volume and cooperation on large-scale projects.

In November, the Belarussian president told Li Lanqing during his visit to Minsk that improving Belarus-Chinese relations was of strategic importance to Belarus, adding that he attached great importance to developing bilateral trade and that he welcomed Chinese entrepreneurs willing to invest in Belarus. The following month, the acting prime minister of Belarus attended a signing ceremony in Beijing for agreements on educational cooperation and on ensuring the quality of exported and imported goods.

A well-documented effort by the Chinese government to gain support in the commission from central European countries began before the 1994 vote. Poland, to the surprise of delegation members themselves, members of Parliament, and local human rights groups, abstained from voting on the no-action resolution instead of voting against it as it had the year before. Instructions from the Polish Ministry of Foreign Affairs had arrived just before the actual vote took place. China had reportedly agreed to support Poland's effort to gain a seat in the Security Council in exchange for the abstention. A representative of the ministry later explained to the Polish parliament that the vote had come about as a result of a "mistake" by a junior official.

In 1995, Li Peng wrote to Polish Prime Minister Pawlak to thank him for his support in Geneva in 1994 and asked for "even more substantial support in 1995." The offer to promote a Security Council seat was reiterated. After the main Warsaw newspaper publicized the "vote trade" and media pressure mounted, Poland's vote against the no-action resolution helped to defeat it.

Two other Central European countries on the 1997 commission have received more attention from the U.S. and Europe than from China, and the commission votes may reflect this. With the exception of 1992 when it abstained, Bulgaria has voted against China in the no-action motion, and the Czech Republic, back on the commission after a hiatus of three years, would be unlikely to succumb to Chinese pressure.

VI. ASIA

Most Asian countries were already voting solidly with China. In 1995 and 1996, the only countries that did not were the three Asian democracies, Japan, the Philippines and Korea. Japan has consistently voted in favor of a resolution; the Republic of Korea has consistently abstained; and the Philippines, which voted with China in 1992 before going off the commission for two years, voted against China in 1995 after a territorial dispute with China flared up in the South China Sea. In 1996, Korea and the Philippines abstained; both were considered swing votes for 1997.

Korea, which resumed diplomatic relations with China in 1992, has heavy economic stakes in China. The chaebol or conglomerate Goldstar is expected to invest US\$10 billion in China by the year 2005, and Daewoo is planning to contribute 960 million *renminbi* (approximately US\$120 million) to the building of an expressway. Daewoo will participate in the operation of the road for thirty years, after which it will belong to Huangshan City, its Chinese partner. During Jiang Zemin's visit to the Philippines in November 1996, China promised to build two power plants and pledged bilateral cooperation.

Other important efforts in Asia included Jiang Zemin's November-December 1996 goodwill tour South Asia with stops in India, Pakistan, and Nepal.

India has consistently voted with China, a reflection perhaps of its own rejection of external human rights pressure, especially on the sensitive issue of Kashmir. Sino-Indian relations, however, have also steadily improved since the collapse of the Soviet Union. Foreign Minister Qian Qichen accompanied President Jiang to India in November 1996 to promote bilateral relations in politics, trade, economy, and culture. The primary issue among the two regional powers was security, and an agreement was reached on military zones on the Sino-Indian border.

While in Nepal in early December 1996 to mark the twenty-fifth anniversary of King Birendra's ascension to the throne of Nepal, Jiang Zemin witnessed the signing of a grant of economic and technical assistance.

In his December swing through Pakistan, a traditional ally and leader of the efforts in the commission to prevent a resolution on China from coming up for debate, Jiang Zemin oversaw the signing of agreements on construction of a hydroelectric power plan, environmental protection, drug trafficking, and establishment of consulates, including maintenance of Pakistan's consulate in Hong Kong. Pakistani President Farooq Leghari noted that there was no difference between Pakistan and China on Tibet, and Pakistan "completely supports China." He also stated how happy he was that China would resume sovereignty over Hong Kong "and hoped for a peaceful joining of Taiwan with China as soon as possible."¹²

VII. WAFFLING IN 1997

It was clear by November 1996 that sponsorship of a resolution on China at the 1997 U.N. Human Rights Commission was in for a rough ride. On November 24, at a debriefing following President Clinton's meeting with Jiang Zemin at the Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation (APEC) summit in Manila, a senior administration official said that "the president said that we want to maintain dialogue and cooperate on [human rights], but on the present record we could not forgo presenting [. . .] a resolution." The implication was clear: any nominal gesture or open-ended promise on China's part that could be interpreted as progress on human rights might be enough to derail a resolution.

The European Union played a similar game of delaying a decision on the resolution by bouncing consideration of the question from one E.U. body to another. When the E.U. Human Rights Working Group (HRWG) could not reach a decision on what to do about a resolution at its meeting on December 13, 1996, further consideration was delayed almost a month until January 10 when the Political Affairs Working Group, with representatives from all fifteen E.U. capitals, met in Brussels. The meeting decided to refer the issue back to the HRWG despite the fact that a straw poll of political directors had found an overwhelming majority in favor of a resolution and the HRWG had recommended that the E.U. move quickly. Rather than taking a firm decision to exert pressure through a resolution, the political affairs meeting discussed a variety of ways of avoiding confrontation at the commission, including pushing for consensus rather than majority vote on resolutions and substitution of investigations by the U.N. thematic mechanisms for commission resolutions.¹³ Just as the HRWG was about to meet on January 23, China suddenly proposed a human rights discussion on February 14 around the edges of the Asia-Europe (ASEM) foreign ministers' meeting in Singapore, providing some E.U. countries with a pretext for delaying a decision once more. (For months, the E.U. had been unsuccessful in trying to schedule a formal E.U.-China human rights dialogue, originally scheduled for October

1996). But China offered no human rights concessions or gestures during the meeting, according to diplomatic sources.

The U.S. also refused to commit itself to the one multilateral initiative that might have exerted real pressure on China, with officials reiterating that Sino-U.S. relations could not be "held hostage" to human rights concerns and that a decision about sponsorship would be made "when the time came." During the U.S. Senate hearing on January 8, 1997 to confirm Madeleine Albright as secretary of state, Albright went so far as to imply that China's previous record was of no import, what counted was "in the remaining weeks" how China "approach[ed] that situation" and whether any changes took place. Different administration officials gave the same message: the U.S. position would be determined based on China's actions between "now"—and "now" became later and later—and the time of the commission vote. A week after Albright's confirmation hearing, the Chinese government warned of complications in the bilateral relationship if the U.S. pressed on rights issues.¹⁴ No concrete promises or assurances resulted from a visit to Beijing on January 30–31 by a low-level delegation from the National Security Council and the State Department, aimed at exploring the possibilities for a human rights breakthrough.

On January 21, the Clinton administration moved to ensure consistency in the U.S.-E.U. position. A diplomatic demarché circulated to E.U. members in Brussels stated that "we are continuing to talk with the Chinese about what meaningful concrete steps they might take to avoid confrontation in Geneva," and it suggested that to make compliance easier, the E.U. ask China for the same minimal concessions: releases of prisoners with medical problems, resumption of discussions on prison visits, and signing and submitting to the National People's Congress for ratification the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. The U.S. did state its willingness to cosponsor a resolution if China's performance did not improve but did not set a time frame or deadline for making a formal decision. President Clinton himself went further, stating at his January 24 press conference that there was no need to press China on human rights because the current government would, like the Berlin Wall, eventually fall.¹⁵

Six days later, the Clinton administration was back to justify no decision in terms of seeking improvements. On January 30, Secretary Albright relayed that message when she met in Washington with Dutch Foreign Minister Hans van Mierlo and Sir Leon Brittan, vice-president of the European Commission and a strong supporter of commercial diplomacy.¹⁶ Given the deterioration of human rights in China across the board over the past year, however, trying to seek "improvements" in the few months before the commission meetings began was disingenuous at best.

Secretary Albright's visit to Beijing on February 24—just prior to Deng Xiaoping's funeral—provided another opportunity to avoid a resolution, pending the outcome of her high-level discussions with Jiang Zemin, Li Peng and other senior officials. A report in the New York Times, published the day she arrived in Beijing, outlined the possible elements of a deal, although the administration vehemently denied the story's suggestion that a bargain was imminent, it did not dispute the other details.¹⁷ Albright left Beijing, empty-handed but noting that breakthroughs before had not come during high-level visits but often several weeks or months afterwards, so as not to give the im-

pression that foreign pressure had been involved.

Three days after her visit, however, a Chinese Foreign Ministry spokesman announced that China was giving "positive consideration" to signing the two major international human rights agreements, the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights. However, he went on to say, "as to when we would join, that is entirely our own affair." It is worth noting that in November 1993, China had announced that it was giving "positive consideration" to access to its prisons by the International Committee of the Red Cross, not long afterwards, negotiations with the ICRC came to a standstill.

But two days after the February 27 statement on the covenants, China announced that it had agreed to "resume our contact [with the ICRC] after a two-year hiatus."¹⁸ An ICRC spokesman noted that these were "talks about talks to begin talks." The only element of a deal that had not been announced by China by the end of February, then, was the release of key dissidents.

It was left to Vice President Gore to try to close any deal during his late March visit. Meanwhile the E.U. had met in Brussels on February 24 and decided to put off any decision on a resolution, waiting instead for the outcome of Albright's trip. Immediately following Gore's visit, Australian Prime Minister John Howard is due in Beijing, as are Canada's foreign minister, Lloyd Axworthy (in April), and French President Jacques Chirac (in May).

While the E.U. and the U.S. were procrastinating, the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights José Ayala Lasso announced on February 10, before the sudden announcement of his resignation, that he had received and accepted in principle an invitation from China to visit. The timing of the invitation was clearly an effort to try to undermine the already dim prospects for a successful resolution by demonstrating China's openness to cooperation on human rights with the U.N.

VIII. CONCLUSION

For the last two years, the diplomacy surrounding a China resolution at the U.N. Human Rights Commission has been marked by a sorry lack of will and outright hypocrisy on the part of those countries that purport to defend human rights. The U.S. and E.U. member governments in particular have watched in near-silence as penalties for dissent in China steadily increased. The one tool that even U.S. and European critics of a vocal human rights policy were willing to support was a resolution in Geneva because it was by definition multilateral and less damaging, it was thought, to bilateral relations.

But by 1997, American and European leaders appeared ready to take any promise the Chinese government was willing to make as evidence of progress on human rights and as a pretext for backing out of a resolution. At the same time, it had ensured that no such resolution could ever pass by holding off so long on the lobbying needed to build support at the commission even as China was engaged in steady and effective lobbying of its own. The U.S. and Europe have sent a clear message that powerful countries will be allowed to abuse international standards with impunity. That signal is a disservice to the United Nations and to the cause of human rights.

FOOTNOTES

¹See, for example, the statements of Chinese diplomats in press releases issued by the U.N. Commission for Human Rights during its 1996 session: Wu Jianmin in Press Release HR/CN/96/03, March 19, 1996, p. 4 and Zhang Jun in Press Release HR/CN/96/13, March 26, 1996, p. 4.

²Washington Post, "U.N. Rights Panel Votes Down Measure Censuring China," March 9, 1995.

³"Failure of UN Human Rights Resolution Hailed," Xinhua, April 24, 1996, in FBIS, CHI-96-081.

⁴Commission members serve for three-year terms, but may serve more than one term.

⁵David Sanger, "Two Roads to China: Nice and Not So Nice—Boeing's Strategy is Appeasement; Microsoft Growls," New York Times, June 9, 1996.

⁶Li Ruihuan, chairman of the National Committee of the Chinese People's Political Consultative Conference (CPPCC) and often suggested as a possible successor to Li Peng, went to Cuba in June 1995, followed by a nine-day trip by Fidel Castro to China in December, his first visit ever.

⁷Li Peng met with the president of Ecuador in May and with the foreign minister of new commission member Uruguay in October. (In June, Uruguay had hosted Wu Yi and a trade delegation. In its previous three years on the commission, 1992–94, Uruguay had abstained on the China no-action votes.) Mexican President Ernesto Zedillo Ponce de Leon met with Jiang Zemin in November 1996.

⁸"Profit and Prejudice: China in Africa," China News Analysis, No. 1574, December 15, 1996, p. 6.

⁹"Profit and Prejudice: China in Africa," China News Analysis, No. 1574, December 15, 1996, p. 6.

¹⁰"Profit and Prejudice: China in Africa," China News Analysis, No. 1574, December 15, 1996, p. 3.

¹¹"Yelstin Adviser Stresses Importance of Upcoming Visit," Xinhua, April 22, 1996; in FBIS-CHI-96-080, April 24, 1996.

¹²"Spokesman on Jiang Zemin Visit," The News (Islamabad), December 2, 1996, Foreign Broadcast Information Service, FBIS-CHI-96-232.

¹³The U.N. thematic mechanisms include, among others, the Special Rapporteurs on Torture; Summary and Arbitrary Execution; Religious Intolerance; Freedom of Expression; Independence of the Judiciary; Violence Against Women; and Sale of Children, as well as Working Groups on Disappearances and Arbitrary Detention. At China's invitation, the Special Rapporteur on Religious Intolerance visited in November 1994. Not only have none of his recommendations been implemented, but religious repression in China has intensified in the two years since the visit. Negotiations for a visit by the Working Group on Arbitrary Detention are ongoing.

¹⁴"Mutual Respect Needed," China Daily (English language version), January 15, 1997, p. 4.

¹⁵"I don't think there is any way that anyone who disagrees with that in China can hold back that [liberty], just as eventually the Berlin Wall fell. I just think it's inevitable." Quoted from his press conference in Jim Mann, "Clinton's 'Berlin Wall' Theory on China Steeped in Paradoxes," Washington Post, February 12, 1997.

¹⁶South China Morning Post, "Rights Action Urged to Avoid Censure," January 30, 1997.

¹⁷Patrick E. Tyler, "U.S. and Chinese Seen Near a Deal on Human Rights," New York Times, February 24, 1997.

¹⁸Patrick E. Tyler, "China and Red Cross Agree to New Talks on Jail Visits," New York Times, March 1, 1997.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I rise in support of this resolution, as amended. The resolution before the House, as amended, urges the administration to reconsider the decision made this weekend as to whether to pursue a resolution of the upcoming meeting in Geneva of the United Nations Human Rights Commission. Two concerns I would like to express about the resolution before I further express my support for the resolution.

The first is the European Union has gone on record as having made a decision not to cosponsor or introduce such a resolution in this upcoming meeting. I think it is terribly important, as our country continues to assert its leadership in the goal in which we all share, which is to advance the issue of human rights in China and around the world, we recognize that the resolutions that we support are those that we want to

win and going into this particular meeting of the U.N. without the support of the European Union could spell disaster in that regard.

The second point to note again is that the administration has made a decision, and that is not to pursue a resolution in this upcoming meeting. Therefore, this resolution before the House today would have been more appropriate to have been brought up last week. The administration has acted. The resolution before the House, as amended, urges the administration to reconsider that decision, but it is unfortunate we are a little behind the curve in that regard.

On balance I think it is necessary for the United States to send a very strong message to China and to the rest of the world that we are concerned about the plight of human rights in China and our resolve in that regard is stronger than ever. People in China, including the government and leadership, need to make no mistake about it. Americans care very deeply about human rights in China. Our ability to have a decent relationship with China will continue to be circumscribed as long as the Chinese government continues to abuse its citizens. I plan to vote for this resolution and urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time. I thank the committee for its hard work in bringing this resolution to the floor. Indeed, as my colleague the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) mentioned, the President announced a decision last Friday, and he said that we were behind the curve. I think indeed that the White House, anticipating a strong vote in this body, tried to preempt the actions of the House of Representatives, knowing that the Senate voted 95 to 5 in favor of this resolution. The administration wanted to cut us off at the pass, and that is why we are not late but they took the action that they did.

Nonetheless, I commend the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and all those who worked to put this resolution together for the administration to reconsider its ill-advised decision, and for the following reasons.

First of all, Mr. Speaker, it would be a very sad, sad occurrence that in this, the 50th anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, that we would give a victory to the authoritarian regime in China by not pursuing a resolution condemning China's human rights practices at the U.N. Human Rights Commission. There is no real progress to report on stated pieces of the administration's human rights policy, including, and these are the criteria the administration uses, ensuring access to Chinese prisons for the Inter-

national Red Cross, promoting a dialogue between his holiness the Dalai Lama and the Chinese government and obtaining the release of political and religious prisoners. The Clinton administration has hung its decision on the slim reed of the agreement by China, the announcement by China to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights. How can it be that this administration would say that because the Chinese say they would sign this document we would not pursue the resolution at the U.N. when the U.S. itself has taken action at the same venue, the same commission, against Nigeria, Iran, Sudan, Iraq, Rwanda, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Yugoslavia and Equatorial Guinea. These countries signed that covenant and the administration, recognizing that that signature is not of itself worth much unless there is ratification and implementation, has in the past pursued a resolution against, for condemnation against these countries at the same venue.

When President Clinton delinked trade and human rights in 1994, he said very, very specifically that he would pursue the issue at the Human Rights Commission, that he would use multilateral fora, including the U.N. commission, and would press, would press for the passage of a resolution, appointed a rapporteur to report on China's human rights violation.

When my colleague says we would like to select fights that we can win, I would beg respectfully to differ. To the people in China and many of their representatives in the dissident community, both in China and in the U.S., namely, for one, Wei Jingsheng, have said that it is very, very important for the U.S. to continue to push for this; whether we win or lose, the Chinese people must know that we stand with them.

He has himself said, I urge, this is from Wei Jingsheng, many members in this body fought for his release from prison, we had hoped it would not be exile from his country, as the Chinese have executed, but release from prison and the ability to speak freely in China. But nonetheless the exiled Wei Jingsheng says, in a letter to Members of Congress, I urge my friends in the United States Congress to clearly show the Chinese people the basic values of the American people. I urge my friends to pass a clear resolution calling upon your Representatives and the Commission for Human Rights in Geneva to hold fast in their position. It is not only for the sake of the American people, but for the whole of humankind. The values of democracy, freedom and human rights far exceed the value of money.

He further says, many Chinese, Wei Jingsheng further says, many Chinese people regard the Human Rights Commission in Geneva as a barometer to measure the support given by the international community to the Chinese people in their struggle for human rights and freedom.

In addition to the voice of the dissidents in support of this resolution, in addition to the promise made by President Clinton to pursue this resolution when he delinked, in addition to the fact that this is the 50th anniversary of the universal declaration of human rights, I urge my colleagues to support this resolution urging the administration to reconsider because the basis of their decision was the Chinese promise to support this other convention, to sign this other convention.

I call to my colleagues' attention, and they may have seen it, I hope so, over the weekend in the newspapers the reports that the Chinese government, that we all remember when President Jiang Zemin was here, he and President Clinton had as the crowning glory, the moment of their summit the agreement by the Chinese that they would no longer sell technology for weapons of mass destruction to Iran. On the strength of that agreement, that written agreement, the Clinton administration recently certified that on the basis of promises, not performance, that the Chinese were in accord, in compliance with the accords in terms of the nuclear arena and that would allow business in the United States to sell nuclear technology to China. Already the Chinese have violated that agreement. When they were caught, the administration tried to hold, to prevent that information, as I mentioned, the Chinese government in violation of a signed agreement with President Clinton, which was the flagship issue of the summit, in violation of that the Chinese government was transferring the technology to the Iranian government, a lifetime supply of materials for the enrichment of uranium. When the Chinese were caught the administration tried to suppress the information to make sure nobody found out about it. When it was made public, the administration declared victory and said, look, we stopped the Chinese from doing what they said they were not going to do in the first place.

The point is their agreements mean nothing. We have to urge the administration to reconsider its decision. I urge my colleagues to vote aye.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for her very strong statement.

I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), who has been a leader on human rights in China for many, many years.

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey who for 18 years has led a fight on this floor trying to help people who are oppressed across this world with human rights violations. I thank the gentleman from Tampa, Florida, who replaced a very good friend of mine, Sam Gibbons, for his remarks as well. As always, we thank the gentlewoman from California. She is a real leader in the fight to try and make the lives of other people throughout this world better.

Mr. Speaker, I reluctantly support this resolution today. I say reluctantly because quite frankly it is a shame, quite frankly it is a scandal that we have to be here at all exhorting our President to do something that he should be doing without us even asking. Our President, continuing his five-year unrequited love affair with these butchers of Beijing, has abandoned the pursuit of improved human rights in China at the U.N. and that is just so sad. So it falls to us here in this Congress to pass this resolution today calling on the President to do the right thing. It is embarrassing, Mr. Speaker.

Once again China's human rights record continues to offend the decent people in this world and everyone admits it; everyone, that is, except the Clinton administration and some unbelievably cowardly governments in Europe who all they want is the almighty dollar. And what a shame that is. Mr. Speaker, a couple of weeks ago, several Members and I had a meeting with Richard Gere. Members know who he is; he is a Hollywood celebrity. He is the cochairman though of the International Campaign for Tibet. Mr. Gere, who travels to the Tibetan refugee camps in India frequently and was with me in Taiwan just a couple of weeks ago, told us how in 1994, when President Clinton shamefully delinked human rights from trade with China, Communist prison guards began immediately beating prisoners telling them that no one was going to help them now. That is not JERRY SOLOMON saying that. That was Richard Gere who strongly campaigned for the President and is sorry that he did because of actions like this.

Unfortunately, we can be sure that the same vile brutality is now taking place in the wake of President Clinton's and the European Union's and the U.N.'s gutless decision not to censure China for its colossal human rights violations. That is why we are here today on this floor. That is why the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) introduced this resolution, and that is why everybody better come over to this floor and they better pass it unanimously.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE).

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), who has been kind enough to join me in serving with the Congressional Children's Caucus, and so I know his commitment to the question of equality, human rights and social justice. Let me acknowledge the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI) as well for continuing this fight for simply humanity in China. The gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), I thank him also for his leadership. I would like this debate to be perceived as a bipartisan debate and really less so about whether Congress is behind the eight ball as to whether or not we in this

body, the chief lawmaking body for this Nation, go on record for a most solemn and important statement and argument.

I happen to have been one who with great trepidation voted for the MFN, the most-favored-nation, based upon the many strong arguments that had been made that if you continue to expose a nation to opportunity, to democracy, to the respect of human rights, you would see gradually those changes coming about.

□ 1530

It would have been interesting to be a fly on the wall during the tumultuous debates regarding the Soviet Bloc, and then as we saw the Berlin Wall fall and the rejoicing of democracy in those parts of the world.

I am hoping and would hope most of us would like to believe that we have that kind of trend moving forward in China. Sadly, as time goes on, I am believing that more is needed, and I certainly think the United Nations resolution dealing with the question of human rights was more than appropriate.

So I join my colleagues on this day of Saint Patrick, as I am wearing green for that special occasion, the patron saint who realized how important it was in his life and in his time that Christianity was being blocked in Ireland. We have many faiths now. We have many views now in this world that is becoming smaller and smaller. Why is China blocking those who may differ with the government? Where is China's patron saint?

I truly believe that the United States Congress has its right and its responsibility to be the patron saint of a country that refuses to acknowledge its place at the world table, and that is with the dignity of human rights.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 364, and I believe that the resolution on the human rights situation in the People's Republic of China at the 54th session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights should be passed.

I know that physically the United States can do little to relieve the suffering of people of other nations at the hands of their own government. In fact, China has said that to us on a regular basis. However, we, as Members of this representative body on behalf of the American people, can voice concerns regarding human rights and argue for our government to take a stand. We must argue when policies are inconsistent with our own interests of simple human justice.

The State Department's country records reports on human rights practices for 1997 states that the Government of China continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses in violation of internationally accepted norms, including extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, arbitrary arrests, detention, forced abortion and sterilization, the

sale of organs from executed prisoners, which, by the way, was reported in the newspaper today again, and tight control over the exercise of rights of freedom of speech, press and religion.

With this in mind, this body must and should encourage the President to reconsider his decision. I believe it is important that we reconsider the decision that was offered just a time a while ago. I believe it is likewise important that we stand on the side of history and continue to fight for human rights and human justice.

It is evident from the leadership of the peace movement and others who have said that the offering and debating of this resolution at the annual U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva advances human rights in China and Tibet. And we must stand by that argument. China in the past has shown a willingness to respond to the concerns of the United States regarding human rights, and I believe that this resolution will make progress in that area.

Therefore, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support this House resolution and recognize that today we stand on behalf of those who deserve human rights and justice in China. Where is China's patron saint? We need that person and that saint now.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of House Resolution 364, which urges the introduction and passage of a resolution on the human rights situation in the People's Republic of China at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

I know that physically the United States can do little to relieve the suffering of people in other nations at the hands of their own governments. However, we as members of this representative body on the behalf of the American people can voice concerns regarding human rights policies which are inconsistent with our own interest and values.

The State Department's Country Reports on Human Rights Practices for 1997 state that the Government of China continues to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, in violation of internationally accepted norms, including extrajudicial killings, the use of torture, arbitrary arrest and detention, forced abortion and sterilization, the sale of organs from executed prisoners, and tight control over the exercise of rights of freedom of speech, press, and religion.

With this in mind this body must and should encourage the President to reconsider his decision announced just a few days ago not to press for a resolution on human rights violations in China and Tibet at the 54th Session of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights.

History is on the side of action in this debate on whether or not to press for a resolution at the upcoming United Nations meeting on human rights. We know that the release last year of Chinese dissident Wei Jingsheng after the U.S.-China summit and just before Chinese Justice Minister Xiao Yang arrived in Washington for talks with U.S. officials came as a result of pressure from the United States.

It is evident from what Wei Jingsheng and others have said that offering and debating this resolution at the annual U.N. Human

Rights Commission in Geneva advances human rights in China and Tibet. In the past the Government of China has made some improvements in human rights just before the annual Human Rights Commission consideration of a China resolution.

We know that conditions for political prisoners improve when the resolution is being debated and they deteriorate when the resolve of the United States weakens.

The United States has stayed the course since 1990 participating in multilateral efforts to gain passage of a United Nations Commission on Human Rights resolution addressing the human rights situation in China. We should not at this point retreat from our position regarding the need to improve human rights in China.

China in the past has shown a willingness to respond to the concerns of the United States regarding human rights, and I believe that this resolution will make progress in that area. Therefore, I strongly encourage my colleagues to support of House Resolution 364.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the full Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of H.Res. 364, and I want to commend the chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), and the ranking minority member of his committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), for crafting this resolution and bringing it before us at this time.

I also want to commend the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), and the distinguished chairman of our Committee on Rules, the gentleman from New York (Mr. SOLOMON), for their strong support of the measure; in addition to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), who has been an activist for human rights in China.

In response to Beijing's announcement last week that it would sign the United Nations Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, and the administration's desire to send President Clinton off to China on a Presidential visit, the Clinton administration has reported that it will not sponsor a China human rights resolution in Geneva. This is distressing to many of us. The President should reconsider his reluctance to underscore our Nation's opposition to China's consistent violations of human rights.

To say the least, Beijing's track record of living up to its promises have not been very impressive. Last October, for example, President Jiang Zemin signed another key treaty, the Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, but the National People's Congress, now in session in Beijing, has not taken any action thus far to ratify that agreement.

In addition, Beijing has agreed to end the sale of nuclear and ballistic missile technology to nations that are linked to terrorism, but their sales continue. They continue to this very day.

Before the President visits China, he really should know when its leaders are going to sign, ratify and implement both of these covenants. The President also needs to know when Beijing will amend its 1993 state security law and when it will abolish administrative detention, including the use of reeducation through labor.

The President also needs to know when Beijing will review the sentences of more than 2,000 who have been convicted as counterrevolutionary offenders with a view towards releasing unconditionally those who are in prison.

And before the President's visit to China, he should be assured that the government in Beijing are going to give regular access to Tibet and to East Turkestan by U.N. and private independent human rights monitors. He should also wait until the Communist government has ended or eased its registration requirements on religious activities and that it is taking concrete steps to protect freedom of association with Chinese workers.

Accordingly, I join with my colleagues in urging this administration and the President to reconsider their reluctance to sponsor the Geneva resolution and to put off the Presidential visit until we see some progress in those critical areas. I urge my colleagues to fully support H.Res. 364.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

I wanted to make one additional point, Mr. Speaker, and that is to address the issue of the European Community not supporting the resolution this year. That decision by the EU does not bind the member states of the EU, and it is possible that some of those countries would support the resolution, and I certainly hope so, but it would require leadership on the part of the United States.

I wanted to make the point that Wei Jingsheng has driven home to us, and that is that as we are considering this resolution, and many of my colleagues feel much more comfortable dealing with human rights in China at the Human Rights Commission, and I think that is very appropriate, and this is not the time to talk about trade issues or MFN, however Wei Jingsheng would want me to say what he has told me over and over again, and that is that the huge trade deficit, \$50 billion this year, that the Chinese enjoys with the U.S., it is a surplus to them, is money that they spend buying, buying, in Europe and other countries that are represented at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights, buying support.

They have effectively silenced any voices for support for this resolution,

and they do it with our own money. How even more necessary for us to take leadership at the Commission.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds, before yielding to the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific to make one additional point.

I think it is very important to point out that the Chinese Government, and Human Rights Watch Asia has done a very fine job in chronicling this, country by country, went out and sought members of the Human Rights Commission in Geneva and provided favors to those governments, money, building supplies, all kinds of materiel in order to buy out those countries from supporting the human rights resolution last year.

I would ask at the appropriate time that that be made a part of the RECORD so that Members can see how the Chinese Government methodically was able to silence its critics.

Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the very distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for yielding me this time.

As an original cosponsor of H. Res. 364, this Member rises in strong support of this resolution which urges the introduction and passage of a resolution on the human rights situation in the People's Republic of China at the U.N. Human Rights Commission in Geneva. The Commission began its annual session on March 16th.

This administration seems to believe strongly in using the United Nations where appropriate. This is the appropriate place for the human rights abuses in China to be brought to the attention of the world community. I regret the fact that it is not going to be pursued by the administration.

The resolution we have before us today, crafted by the gentleman from New Jersey, with input from many people, including this Member, quotes from the State Department Human Rights Report of 1997 noting that the Government of China continued to commit widespread and well-documented human rights abuses, which included extrajudicial killings, torture, forced abortion and sterilization, as well as expanded attempts to control religion.

Certainly Beijing is annoyed that year after year the United States has raised this issue at the U.N. Human Rights Commission. But for many in this body who are genuinely interested in Sino-American relations, human rights is an entirely appropriate U.S. concern. Thus, this Member regrets that late last week the administration decided not to press for a U.N. resolution censuring China for human rights

abuses, citing that the Beijing Government is gradually changing it is progressive practices and may be ready to make new releases of political dissidents. That may be a correct conclusion. I hope it is. But I do believe it is the wrong approach.

I think we use this Human Rights Commission forum whenever appropriate. And while it is true that during the past year China has made some concessions, such as the release of dissident Wei Jingsheng from prison, this Member urges the administration to continue to press China on human rights even if the U.N. meeting in China, very unfortunately, is not to be the forum by the choosing of this administration.

As the Members of this body are aware, this Member supports engagement with the People's Republic of China. This year's summit represented expanded engagement of the PRC, which this Member believes will successfully promote Democratic ideals and standards throughout this country. That said, this does not mean that we should remain silent regarding human rights abuses in China.

The gentlewoman from California has brought up the European Commission and the European Union, and I think that is entirely appropriate. They say we are not going to pursue this in the U.N. Human Rights Commission because we believe in constructive engagement. Well, so do I, and so do many Members of this body, and so do the administrations of both parties, but that does not mean that we fail to use the U.N. Human Rights Commission.

I think it is a shameful lack of courage on the part of the Commission. I am talking about the European Commission and the European Union. It is true, as the gentlewoman said, that members are free to go their own way and support and introduce such a resolution before the U.N. Human Rights Commission. Denmark had the courage to do that last year. China threatened repercussions on Denmark when they took that stance, and perhaps they delivered on that. But I do not think that should be any excuse for the lack of courage on the part of the Europeans in this respect. And they are very quick to give us advice gratuitously. Let it be said that this Member, and I think many Members of this body, are discouraged and very upset with their decision.

This resolution, therefore, is an important statement on the part of the U.S. House of Representatives. It puts, through H.Res. 364, us on record that the very real human rights questions and concerns that the American people have raised regarding the PRC are certainly voiced in this body.

This Member again commends the author of the resolution, the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for this initia-

tive. He has pursued it previously, as already mentioned.

This Member also thanks the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), for assisting us in moving this initiative in such an expeditious manner.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to vote for the adoption of H.Res. 364.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds to thank my good friend from Nebraska, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific. He is very much involved on a day-to-day basis with what is going on in China. We have worked cooperatively on this resolution. He had some very useful text changes, and we thank him for that.

I wanted to thank the chairman of the full committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), who is always a great friend of human rights; the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI); and I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. LANTOS), my ranking member of the subcommittee, and all the Members who have helped forge this legislation.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as an original cosponsor of H. Res. 364, a resolution urging the President to secure passage of a resolution on China's human rights record at the annual meeting of the United Nations Commission on Human Rights (UNCHR) this month in Geneva.

During the past eight years, the United States Government has participated in nearly all of the annual efforts to pass a resolution at the UNCHR addressing the Chinese Government's human rights policies. This pressure has generated limited but important results, such as the Chinese government's signing of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights and inviting the U.N. Working Group on Arbitrary Detention to visit last October.

I have long believed that we should press for improvements in the human rights situation in China through the use of multilateral forums such as the UNCHR, bilateral negotiations, and other mechanisms such as the annual debate over renewing Most-Favored-Nation status for China.

Critics of the annual debate on Most-Favored-Nation status for China, however, have argued that removal of MFN trade treatment for China is an instrument too blunt for the task at hand. They have urged that in place of U.S. unilateral action the U.S. should pursue efforts to ensure a multilateral approach to influence Beijing's human rights practices. When the Administration decided in 1994 to delink the MFN issue from human rights considerations, the President acknowledged that the multilateral dimension of our engagement on human rights in China remained critical. At that time, he stated that "the U.S. should step up efforts, in cooperation with other states, to insist that the U.N. Commission on Human Rights pass a resolution dealing with the serious human rights abuses in China."

To that end, earlier this year I wrote to the President with Democratic Whip DAVID BONIOR and Representative NANCY PELOSI to urge that

the United States Government sponsor and actively lobby for a resolution on China's human rights record at this month's meeting of the U.N. Commission on Human Rights. In our letter, we argued that it would be a serious mistake, given the wide scale and continuing human rights abuses in China and Tibet, to remove that pressure before China takes concrete steps to comply with international standards. These steps must include significant improvement in China's overall human rights practices, including granting freedom of speech, association, and religion; enacting major legal reforms, including repealing state security laws and abolishing all so-called "counter-revolutionary" crimes; releasing political prisoners; acting to protect freedom of association for workers; and opening up Tibet to human rights monitors.

I was extremely disappointed to learn on Friday that the Administration has decided against pressing for passage of a resolution on China's human rights practices at the U.N. Commission later this month. Failure to press for passage of a resolution will seriously undermine our efforts to influence Chinese human rights policies and represents a step backwards in our efforts to advance the cause of freedom across the globe.

In making its announcement, the Administration noted that China intends to sign the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, which would bring about improved multilateral oversight of China's human rights practices. While I agree that China's participation in this Covenant will be a significant achievement if it follows through on its commitment, it does not adequately substitute for the annual review and dialogue provided by the U.N. Human rights Commission. After China's first year of participation under this Covenant, its human rights practices will be subject to international oversight only once every five years.

We must regularly review China's record in this area to continually draw international attention to its flagrant abuses of human rights. Only through such a review can we hope to sustain the momentum necessary to have any hope for meaningful and systematic changes in China's behavior. Examination of China's human rights practices only once every five years is insufficient to create any real momentum for change. In fact, this will best serve the Chinese Government's interest by keeping these issues out of public debate most of the time.

Furthermore, I am deeply concerned that a failure by the United States to take a leading role on this issue at this crucial juncture would bolster efforts made by China in recent years to eliminate all international comment on its human rights practices, and would further fuel China's efforts to weaken the definition of basic universal human rights and the mechanisms designed to protect them.

It would be particularly disappointing on the fiftieth anniversary of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights if China should succeed in its efforts to escape the scrutiny of the one international body mandated to protect and promote human rights. The U.N. Commission on Human Rights is one of the few instruments by which the international community has the opportunity to voice concern about human rights practices around the world. Lack of action at the U.N. Commission on Human Rights would greatly undermine multilateral pressure on the Chinese government.

I hope the President will reconsider his decision not to lead efforts at the U.N. Human Rights Commission later this month, and I urge all Members to support the adoption of this resolution.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 364.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1545

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 364, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

COMMENDING DEMOCRACY IN BOTSWANA

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H. Res. 373) commending democracy in Botswana.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 373

Whereas Sir Ketumile Masire has been involved in politics in his country since he co-founded the Bechuanaland Democratic Party (later the Botswana Democratic Party) with Seretse Khama in 1962;

Whereas Sir Ketumile Masire was elected to Botswana's first Parliament in 1965, later became Vice President under President Seretse Khama, and succeeded President Khama as President upon his death in 1980;

Whereas under President Masire's administration Botswana has maintained a successful multiparty constitutional democracy with regular free and fair elections;

Whereas President Masire plans to retire from the presidency on March 31, 1998;

Whereas the Government of Botswana has worked constructively with the Organization of African Unity, the Southern African Development Community, and other organizations to promote democracy in Africa;

Whereas Botswana is a long standing friend of the United States and was selected as the site of a major Voice of America radio relay station because of its stability; and

Whereas President Clinton plans to enhance United States relations with Botswana through an upcoming official visit to Botswana: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) commends the people of Botswana for their commitment to democracy;

(2) commends Sir Ketumile Masire for his long and distinguished service to his country and the cause of democracy in Africa;

(3) calls on President Masire's successor to pursue the course set by President Masire by maintaining a democratic Botswana;

(4) calls on the Government of Botswana to continue playing a positive role in African and world affairs; and

(5) encourages the Government of Botswana to continue promoting peace, democracy, respect for human rights, and economic reform in Africa.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE).

(Mr. ROYCE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on H. Res. 373.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, this resolution recognizes the government of Botswana and the people of Botswana for their long-standing commitment to democracy. Since he took office in 1980, President Ketumile Masire has presided over a government that has honored the democratic process. His government has been a model of democratically-rooted stability and development for Africa, and it has been a model for the world.

Botswana also is a long-standing friend of the United States and has played a constructive diplomatic role in Africa and in the world. Yet Botswana is a bit of a forgotten African country. This bill brings attention to Botswana by commending its people for their democratic commitment.

After nearly 18 years in office, President Masire is stepping down within days of our action here today. The resolution commends him for his service to his country. All too often, we criticize African leaders for the things they do wrong, but we seldom take the opportunity to commend them for a job well done. This resolution offers us the chance to send such a positive message.

Botswana has been at the vanguard of African democratic and economic reform. This southern African nation has been a model for its neighbors and in several forums has worked diligently to promote peace and cooperation. At this time of renaissance for Africa, it is altogether appropriate for us to acknowledge the positive role Botswana has made in Africa and on the world stage.

The bill has bipartisan support, as demonstrated by its unanimous approval by the Committee on International Relations last week.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in support of the resolution.

Botswana is a success story. It is one of Africa's oldest continuous democracies. It has been active in promoting regional integration in southern Africa. Its military has a very professional reputation; and Botswana has been active in social programs, including conservation efforts.

Congress is going on record today in recognition of that success and commending President Masire for his leadership on the eve of his retirement. I hope this resolution will encourage Botswana to continue its democratic tradition and to continue its constructive foreign policies.

I would like to urge my colleagues to join the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and me in recognizing Botswana's success by voting yes on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of our Subcommittee on Africa, and the cosponsors of this resolution, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the ranking Democrat on the Subcommittee on Africa, and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE). This resolution passed our committee by a voice vote March 12.

Botswana is highly deserving of the praise contained in this resolution. Its great progress on democracy and free-market economics since independence is a model for other nations in the region and elsewhere. I am pleased that President Clinton is going to be visiting Botswana later this month during his historic trip to Africa.

Botswana's neighborhood is southern Africa, which today is an island of stability on the troubled continent of Africa. Peace has taken hold in Mozambique, apartheid has been vanquished in South Africa, and the senseless killing in Angola appears to be over.

Even when this region was not so stable and when Botswana was surrounded by wars and oppressive regimes, Botswana managed to embrace the best of Western values and to provide its people with an increasingly higher standard of living. This is no small accomplishment in that part of the world.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to support this worthy resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), a member of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I do want to thank my colleague, the chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, for yielding me the time. I want to commend him and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) and all the cosponsors of this resolution.

As the gentleman from California mentioned a few minutes ago, sometimes it appears we only bring resolutions which criticize other countries. Here is an example of a country which has moved in a very exemplary fashion in so many areas.

Since its independence in September of 1996, Botswana has been a successful multiparty democracy. It has consistently scored high in human rights reports by the State Department. It has been a long-standing ally of the United States, and it has consistently supported U.S. positions in international fora. Through increased adherence to free-market principles, Botswana has experienced remarkable economic growth, it has made U.S. economic assistance unnecessary, and it has done it in a part of a continent where that is not always the case.

We often encourage African countries to spend money on social concerns such as education and health, and the President Masire government has done exactly that. Unlike so many other leaders in many countries and certainly in Africa, the President is stepping down voluntarily. The ruling Botswana Democratic Party offered him the chance to be exempt from new term limits on the presidency, but he refused. I think he is setting an outstanding example for the future in this multiparty democracy.

It is entirely appropriate that we do commend Botswana for the very impressive progress they have made. I commend my colleague for bringing this to the attention of the House.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, President Clinton is scheduled to visit Botswana later this month. I am scheduled to accompany him on that trip. We have spoken with the administration about this resolution, and they strongly support this measure as a positive sign to our friends in Botswana.

It would be my honor to present this resolution to President Masire on behalf of this House. I urge my colleagues to make this possible by approving this resolution today.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this Botswana resolution. President Clinton will be traveling to Botswana in March. He chose Botswana not only for the country's strong democratic values but the increase in economic growth. The economy is market oriented, with strong encouragement for private enterprise. The diamond revenues and solid economic and fiscal

policies has resulted in improved growth. Per capita gross domestic product was approximately \$2800 last year, and it is increasing at a robust annual rate of approximately 7 percent. I understand that elections should take place soon and the Botswana Democratic Party leader, Mr. Masire, will be handing over the reins to his Vice President. Many years ago in Africa when a President took over, he was President for life. We have seen that in Malawi where life President Banda just recently after 30 years handed it over. This is a step really in the right direction.

Let me say that I had the opportunity to participate in a forum to voice my concerns to the NSC and State Department before the President embarks upon his journey to Africa. One thing that came out of the dialogue is that women are a dominant and important part of the economy throughout Africa. Ghanaian women account for almost 90 percent of the market economy. I know the government of Botswana is working to make improvements in this area. Two years ago I applauded the government for taking the initiative to formulate a long-term plan of action to implement the National Policy on Women specifically working on property rights.

In conclusion, let me say that we should congratulate countries like Botswana and that they are eager to be in the first round of the Growth and Opportunity Act. As a matter of fact, for the last 4 or 5 years, Botswana has had a surplus of over a billion dollars each year which has been put aside into the coffers of that country. I would once again like to congratulate that outstanding country and look forward to visiting there with the President in the coming week.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT).

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. I rise in strong support of the resolution. I want to commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Africa, for offering this thoughtful and timely resolution. As a member of the subcommittee, I have had the pleasure of working closely with the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE). I think I speak for all the Members when I say we appreciate his able leadership. I also want to commend the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the committee; the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), the ranking member of the subcommittee; and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE) for their work on this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, Botswana is one of the great success stories of sub-Saharan Africa. As the President prepares to embark on his historic trip to that part of the world, it is fitting that we send along a message of commendation and encouragement to the government and

the people of Botswana. Under the leadership of President Masire, Botswana has maintained a successful, multiparty constitutional democracy with free and fair elections. This resolution commends Mr. Masire on the occasion of his retirement and calls upon his political successors to continue promoting peace, democracy, respect for human rights and economic reform in Africa.

Mr. Speaker, this is a well-crafted resolution that deserves the support of every Member of this body. I want to again commend the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) and the other Members that I referred to. I also want to commend the President on making this trip to Africa. I urge support for the resolution.

Mr. ROYCE. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from California (Mr. ROYCE) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 373.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CALLING FOR FREE AND IMPARTIAL ELECTIONS IN CAMBODIA

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and agree to the resolution (H.Res. 361) calling for free and impartial elections in Cambodia, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. RES. 361

Whereas Cambodia continues to recover from years of political conflict, civil war, the era of Khmer Rouge genocide, and subsequent foreign invasion;

Whereas the 1991 Paris Peace Accords contributed significantly to a process of political accommodation, national conciliation, and the establishment of a state based on democratic ideals;

Whereas the people of Cambodia overwhelmingly demonstrated their support for the democratic process through the participation of over 93 percent of eligible voters in the United Nations-sponsored 1993 elections;

Whereas the commitment of the Cambodian people to democracy and stability is reflected in the national constitution guaranteeing fundamental human rights;

Whereas the international donor community has supported the democratic process in Cambodia by contributing over \$3,000,000,000 to peacekeeping and national reconstruction efforts;

Whereas notwithstanding the notable societal and economic reforms made subsequent to the 1993 elections, tensions within the Cambodian Government continued to mount, culminating in the July 5, 1997, military coup by which Second Prime Minister Hun Sen deposed the duly elected First Prime Minister Prince Ranariddh;

Whereas the Hun Sen government has yet to adequately investigate the killings and human rights abuses which occurred at the time of the July 5, 1997, coup and which were detailed in the August 21, 1997, Hammarberg report;

Whereas Second Prime Minister Hun Sen made a commitment to the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights (UNCHR) to extend the mandate of UNCHR;

Whereas an ongoing atmosphere of intimidation has prevented many of the political exiles who have returned to Cambodia from carrying out their activities in preparation for the election scheduled for July 26 without fear;

Whereas questions remain concerning the independence and impartiality of the newly created National Election Commission;

Whereas the failure of the Hun Sen Government to agree to arrangements for the expeditious return of Prince Ranariddh calls into serious question the possibility of a credible election; and

Whereas the European Union has unwisely decided to provide 9,500,000 ECU's (approximately \$11,500,000) in aid to the Hun Sen regime to prepare for the July election in the absence of conditions that would allow a credible election: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the House of Representatives—

(1) calls upon the Cambodian Government—

(A) to fully implement the Paris Peace Accords;

(B) to enforce the rule of law and fully protect human rights, including a thorough investigation of the extrajudicial killings and human rights abuses which occurred following the July 5, 1997, coup and punishment of those involved;

(C) to restore a nonviolent and neutral political atmosphere, including strict adherence to the cease-fire announced on February 27, 1998;

(D) to allow all exiled opposition leaders, including First Premier Ranariddh, to return to Cambodia and to engage in political activity without fear of political or physical reprisal; and

(E) to take further measures to create mechanisms to help ensure a credible election, including a truly independent and impartial election commission and provisions to allow domestic and international observers to monitor the entire election process;

(2) commends the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN) for its efforts to restore democratic governance in Cambodia and urges a continuation of these efforts;

(3) calls upon the European Union to reconsider its decision to provide assistance to the election process until such time as genuinely free and fair elections can be conducted;

(4) urges the Secretary of State to continue to provide support through appropriate nongovernmental organizations to the courageous Cambodian human rights workers who persevere in their difficult task, despite the considerable risk at which they put themselves;

(5) calls upon the Secretary of State to work with members of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations and with members of the Donors group in urging the Cambodian Government to create the conditions which would guarantee a free and fair election;

(6) calls upon the Cambodian Government to work cooperatively with the Phnom Penh office of the United Nations Centre for Human Rights and urges the United States Government and the international community to support the efforts of the Centre to promote human rights in Cambodia by providing the additional financial assistance needed to increase the number of United Nations human rights monitors in Cambodia; and

(7) states its unwillingness to accept as legitimate or as worthy of United States assistance any Cambodian government that arises from a fraudulent electoral process.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on House Resolution 361.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. BEREUTER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, as the author of H.Res. 361, this Member rises to urge the government of Cambodia to create conditions which would ensure a free, fair, and credible election in that troubled country.

Mr. Speaker, this Member would tell his colleagues that 7 months after a violent coup ousted the democratically elected First Premier Prince Ranariddh from power, Cambodia's prospects for democracy remain a shattered dream.

Those democratic hopes were considerably brighter in 1993 when an international effort led by the United Nations oversaw Cambodia's first democratic elections. Nearly 90 percent of the eligible electorate took part in that contest which chose FUNCINPEC's Prince Ranariddh as Prime Minister. Hun Sen, however, refused to accept the people's verdict and threatened a coup if not allowed a major role in the new government. Hun Sen's stand resulted in an unnatural, and ultimately unworkable, coalition government.

The fragile coalition finally disintegrated last July when Hun Sen violently expelled Prince Ranariddh from the government. Many prominent opposition leaders fled into exile. Many of these politicians have now returned to Cambodia to prepare for the elections scheduled for July 26. However, because of continued intimidation by forces close to the Hun Sen regime, these politicians have not been able to conduct normal political activities. The media, as well, has been cowed by the same forces of intimidation.

Within Cambodia, human rights workers persevere in their difficult task, often at considerable personal risk. Today, 7 months after the fact, Hun Sen's regime has yet to investigate the many instances of extrajudicial killing that took place at the time of the coup and since, despite repeated calls for accountability from domestic and international groups.

H.Res. 361 cites the coup d'état of July 1997 and subsequent extrajudicial killings, the ongoing atmosphere of political intimidation, the questionable

impartiality of the election law and the newly created National Election Commission, and the failure of the Hun Sen regime to facilitate the expeditious return of Prince Ranariddh and his full participation in the election process as indications that conditions do not yet exist to conduct free, fair, and credible elections.

In response to these problems, H.Res. 361 urges the Cambodian government to fully enforce the Paris Peace Accords; to restore a nonviolent and neutral political atmosphere; to allow all exiled opposition leaders, including First Premier Ranariddh, to return to Cambodia and engage in political activity without fear of political or physical reprisal; and to take further measures to ensure a credible election.

H.Res. 361 then also calls on all sides in the domestic dispute to abide by the cease-fire of February 27, 1998. It commends the work of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, and the U.N. Centre for Human Rights for their ongoing efforts to restore democratic governance to Cambodia. It calls upon the United States Government to continue its support for human rights NGOs in Cambodia.

Finally, H.Res. 361 states our unwillingness to accept as legitimate or worthy of U.S. assistance a Cambodian government resulting from a fraudulent election.

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on International Relations unanimously adopted H.Res. 361. This Member believes that H.Res. 361 represents a balanced assessment of the situation in Cambodia and our prescription for advancing democracy and human rights in that beleaguered nation.

This Member also thanks the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the Committee on International Relations, and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the distinguished majority leader, for moving this initiative in such an expeditious manner.

This Member also expresses appreciation to the distinguished gentleman from Indiana (Mr. HAMILTON), the ranking member of the Committee on International Relations for his constructive additions to this resolution.

This Member also thanks the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. BERMAN), the ranking member of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, for his assistance in speeding this resolution before this body.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of H.Res. 361.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1600

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I strongly support this resolution and commend the gentleman from Nebraska for bringing it before the House today. The next few months may well determine the future of Cambodia for years to come. With good fortune

and concerted effort on the part of the Cambodian people as well as the international community, democracy may begin to take root in Cambodia. But there is also a real chance that the forces of tyranny and hatred may triumph in Cambodia, once again bringing chaos and misery to that tragic land.

The resolution before us today represents a vote for democracy. It demonstrates our commitment to political pluralism and a Cambodia whose people can live in peace and without fear. It deserves our support. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting yes on this important resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations.

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time. Mr. Speaker, I want to commend the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER), the distinguished chairman of the Subcommittee on Asia and the Pacific, for introducing this resolution that calls for free and fair elections in Cambodia and for keeping this issue in the forefront of the work of this House and before the public.

The people of Cambodia who expressed their overwhelming commitment to the democratic process in the U.N.-sponsored elections in 1993 deserve the unflinching support of the American people, of this body and our government and the entire international community. But as we well know, democracy is in dire danger in Cambodia. The illegitimate government of Hun Sen continues to oppress and impose its political will on the people of Cambodia and threatens the legitimacy of a democratic process that many, both inside and outside Cambodia, worked so hard to create. The people of Cambodia deserve much better.

With only 4 short months until the proposed July national elections, H. Res. 361 is an extremely timely resolution. It is critical that our body continue to bring to the attention of the American people and to the world the plight of Cambodia and those struggling for democracy there. We must also call upon others such as ASEAN and the European Union to do the right thing and to support a genuine democratic process in Cambodia by way of a free, fair and fully representative election. These elections must be fully representative of the Cambodian people and we should accept nothing less.

Although I believe my views on the subject are well known, I want to reiterate my strong support for the democratic forces in Cambodia and for the good people of Cambodia who have suffered so much and deserve so much better. While all of us are disappointed in the current state of affairs, we are

committed to bringing democracy, justice, peace and freedom once again to the kingdom of Cambodia and to the Khmer people. There is much work to do between now and the elections. I think this resolution expressing the sense of Congress is certainly a good and worthy start. I am proud to be a cosponsor. I look forward with the help of our colleagues to passing it today on the floor of the House.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank my colleague from New York for his comments. He is absolutely right. The people of Cambodia have been very long suffering. They deserve better. We are headed for a noncredible, disastrous election unless the world community lets the Hun Sen regime know that we will not accept election results, that we expect better, that we expect that candidates for office, including Prince Ranariddh will be able to come back and to campaign unimpeded by physical intimidation. This House will be asked to vote in a recorded vote in a few minutes. I would hope that my colleagues will give a unanimous positive vote for this resolution. This is a resolution where we may indeed have an impact on Cambodia and on the international community.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Nebraska for his keen sense of timing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this should be a very busy time for this House. Many of us should come to the floor in support of these resolutions. I thank the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER). I know that we spent some time together at the European Union on these issues. I think certainly H. Res. 361, if I might, simply adds to the importance of allowing for free and impartial elections, the rule of law and human rights.

I really rise, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Human Rights Caucus, and therefore these issues are very, very near and dear to our effort and the message that I believe is very important as a part of this Nation's foreign policy. For too many we have been chastised for trying to be the police of the world. I would rather think of us as the conscience of the world. Certainly it is important with so many Cambodians here in the United States that we recognize the importance of free elections and human rights.

I believe that human rights allows a nation to stand on its feet. Human rights engenders economic opportunity and advancement. Human rights provides for opportunities to educate all of your people. Human rights gives the free marketplace an opportunity to work. And so H. Res. 361 is more than policing the world, it is opening the doors of opportunity.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would like to add my appreciation and support of H. Res. 373, which is commending democracy in Botswana. Here we have a very small nation of 2 million people in sub-Saharan Africa. I had the pleasure of visiting it as part of the presidential mission in December. Probably to the surprise of many of my colleagues, this nation has been democracy filled for 31 years. In fact it has created a multiparty democracy. It is the oldest freestanding democracy in Africa with their first President elected, Mr. Koma, in 1966, who remained in office until his passing. With the present President Mr. Masire, who came in 1994, they have had an unblemished record of democracy. What has it engendered for them? A high economy, free housing for many of its citizens, peace in the streets. And so the question becomes to my colleagues, I hope that they will support both of these resolutions, because what does peace and human rights and justice beget us? It begets us the opportunities that we have here in this country. Yes, America's foreign policy and domestic policy are not perfect, but it certainly does not mean that we cannot stand up and demand and require our allies and friends to recognize the importance and value of human rights.

With that, Mr. Speaker, I would ask certainly for continued support and passage of H. Res. 373 and support for H. Res. 361.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I want to take a moment this afternoon to join in support of H. Res. 373 and recognize the remarkable efforts of the government of Botswana in stabilizing the practice of democracy not only in their own country, but throughout all of the Southern part of the African continent. Since its independence from British rule in 1966, Botswana has been nothing less than a powerful reminder to all of us about the untapped potential of having a politically liberated Africa. So in this very brief amount of time that I have been allotted, I want to share with you Botswana's secret; I want to cite the reasons why they have deservedly captured the attention of the world.

First of all, Botswana has captured the world's attention by creating a multi-party democracy that without exception is an outstanding parallel to our own. From the election of their first President, Seretse Khama in 1966, who brilliantly served the people of Botswana until his passing in 1980, to the re-election of their current President, Ketumile Masire, in 1994, Botswana has established an unblemished record of conducting extremely fair political contests. No ethnic, racial or religious minorities are excluded from participation in the electoral process. No one political party or affiliation stronghandedly dominates the political landscape of the country. In essence, the rule is simply that all of the citizens of Botswana after the age of 21 are given the opportunity to exercise the franchise, freely.

But most importantly, Botswana has captured our attention, because the will of its people is sovereign. The Constitution of Botswana establishes a system of government similar to that of our British allies across the Atlantic. Botswana has a parliamentary legislature with

a traditional separation of powers that is equally divided by checks and balances amongst three independent branches of government: the executive, the legislative and the judicial. This is a system of government that is not much different than the one envisioned by Baron de Montesquieu, in his *magnus opus*, *The Spirit of the Laws*, over two centuries ago. It is a perfect and fair model of the ideal civil libertarian state. But despite all of these shining political achievements, we all know that a nation's political structure is only one part, albeit extremely necessary part, of a nation's success.

The fact of the matter is that a nation's future is as much premised upon its economic stability as it is on its political stability. And Botswana, in this arena as well, has done nothing but distinguish itself. All of the relevant statistics about recent financial growth in Africa indicate that Botswana's economy has been on an upward climb for over two decades now. This kind of responsible fiscal management is the reason why ground-breaking bills like the African Growth and Opportunity Act are being considered and passed in this House. Because today is truly a new age, my friends. This is an age where the human rights grievances and political instabilities of Africa's past are quickly slipping away. This is a time that will be remembered by future generations as the period when Africa began to move rapidly into the economy of the post-industrialized information age, as both our mutually beneficial partner and our friendly competitor. So I stand here proudly today to salute the nation of Botswana, to salute our many friends on the continent of Africa, and finally, to salute the prosperous future that I am sure we will have together.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I have no further requests for time, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I want to thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) for their comments regarding Cambodia. The gentlewoman from Texas also made very commendable comments on Botswana.

Mr. Speaker, I urge unanimous support and a recorded vote for the Cambodia resolution to do what we can to ensure free and fair and credible elections in Cambodia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 361, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. BEREUTER. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

EXPRESSING SENSE OF CONGRESS REGARDING NORTHERN IRELAND

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules

and agree to the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 152) expressing the sense of the Congress that all parties to the multiparty peace talks regarding Northern Ireland should condemn violence and fully integrate internationally recognized human rights standards and adequately address outstanding human rights violations as part of the peace process, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 152

Whereas multiparty talks regarding Northern Ireland attended by representatives of the British and Irish Governments and representatives elected from political parties in Northern Ireland are underway for the first time since the partition of Ireland in 1922 creating a momentous opportunity for progress on human rights concerns;

Whereas human rights violations and the lack of accountability by those responsible for such violations have been persistent features of the conflict in Northern Ireland; and

Whereas more than 3,000 people have died and thousands more have been injured as a result of the political violence in Northern Ireland since 1969: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That—

(1) the Congress condemns the violence committed on all sides of the conflict in Northern Ireland as illegal, unjust, and inhumane;

(2) the Congress commends the leadership in both the British and Irish Governments and former United States Senator George Mitchell, Independent Chairman of the multiparty talks, for fostering a new environment in which human rights concerns may be addressed and an agreement may be reached expeditiously through inclusive talks with respect to Northern Ireland; and

(3) it is the sense of the Congress that—

(A) all parties should reject violence and work diligently through democratic, peaceful means to reach a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland;

(B) human rights should be protected for all citizens and any peace agreement in Northern Ireland must recognize the state's obligation to protect human rights in all circumstances; and

(C) there are a number of measures which can be taken immediately that would remedy abusive human rights policies and build confidence in the peace process, such as acting upon the Standing Advisory Commission on Human Rights (SACHR) report and recommendations put forth by other human rights organizations.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

First of all, this resolution is a bipartisan resolution. I am very pleased and honored to have the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the Committee on International Relations, as one of the principal cosponsors of this bill; also, the gentleman from New York (Mr. KING); the gentleman from New York (Mr. MANTON);

the gentleman from New York (Mr. WALSH); the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. KENNEDY); the gentleman from New York (Mr. McHUGH); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE); the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. SHAYS); the gentleman from New York (Mr. HINCHEY); the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. ANDREWS); and the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Mrs. KENNELLY) to name just some of the cosponsors of this H. Con. Res. 152.

Mr. Speaker, we are expressing a sense of the Congress that all parties to the multiparty peace talks regarding Northern Ireland should condemn violence and fully integrate internationally recognized human rights standards and address the outstanding human rights violations as part of the peace process.

Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to note that Amnesty International, Human Rights Watch, the British Irish Watch, the Committee on the Administration of Justice, Lawyers Committee for Human Rights, and many, many others have urged that this House pass this resolution.

As a matter of fact, just to read some of their statements, Human Rights Watch said, "Human Rights Watch fully supports the resolution now being considered for passage by the Congress regarding human rights in the Northern Ireland peace process. The resolution rightly recognizes the gravity of past violations and the role that such abuses have played in perpetuating the conflict. The resolution is a signal that Congress is eager to prevent the same kind of lack of attention to human rights issues which has doomed other peace processes and may threaten the success of the Northern Ireland peace process if action is not taken now."

Mr. Speaker, the Committee on the Administration of Justice and I recently traveled to the north of Ireland, met with all of the parties, like other Members of this House have and other Members of the Senate, but I found that the Committee on the Administration of Justice tries to evenhandedly promote human rights. Whether they be Protestant or Catholic, a person's value and dignity must be respected.

Well, of the committee, Martin O'Brien stated, and I quote, "Any effort by Congress to raise these issues is particularly welcomed and deserves widespread support. In that regard, the initiative is to be supported, and it would be helpful if the concerns of the Congress on human rights be raised with the British and the Irish Governments," and it goes on, and I would put the full statement into the RECORD at the appropriate time.

Mr. Speaker, there is a great opportunity, a window of opportunity right now, especially on St. Patrick's Day, but in the coming weeks as part of these multiparty talks to come to a conclusion. We need to express in a bipartisan way, Democrats, Republicans, moderates, liberals and conservatives, that we are foursquare, fully behind

this effort to bring peace to the north of Ireland where some 3,000 people have been killed by paramilitaries on both sides, as well as by agents of the British Government.

It is time to say no to violence; that no matter what dips may be in the road ahead, that violence is not a solution. Knee-capping and terrorism is not a means to an end, no matter how justified one may think they are. Whether it be the IRA on the Catholic side or perhaps on the Protestant side, some of the terrorist groups, all of those acts of violence are to be condemned, and we ought to be promoting peace, and that is, indeed, what we are doing. Thankfully, the United States is playing a very real and significant role.

Former Senator Mitchell is the chairman of these multiparty talks and has done an exemplary job in bringing the disparate factions together to try to come to a peaceful resolution.

Again, this window of opportunity is right now before them. The discussions begin in earnest again on March 23, and we expect, hopefully before Easter, that there will be a framework, there will be a final document produced; maybe that is a bit premature, but that is part of the expectation, and that a referendum could be held sometime in the latter part of May, perhaps in June, to begin or to further this process.

I found on that trip, and I have also had two lengthy human rights hearings in my subcommittee in which we heard from all parties, that the time for peace is at hand, and I think by going on the record today, we send a clear, unmistakable message that we, too, are watching and hoping and praying that peace will come to the north of Ireland and that human rights will be at its core. It cannot be an ancillary issue; it cannot be a P.S., a postscript at the end of the statement. They need to be integral in this peace agreement, and all parties, I think, need to recognize the value and the dignity of each and every human life, and that is what I think will lead to justice, and justice to a sustainable peace.

So I would hope that everyone could get behind H. Con. Res. 152 and we could make a unanimous statement here on the floor today that we are for this peace process.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PAYNE).

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of ending the sad state presently in the north of Ireland. This resolution goes to the heart of the matter, and let me commend the sponsor and those who are supporting this great resolution.

I had the distinct pleasure last Thursday of introducing Mr. Gerry Adams, the President of Sinn Féin, at

my alma mater at Seton Hall, at the university where thousands came to hear his talk. It was sponsored by the School of Diplomacy at Seton Hall, and he went on to discuss what must be done.

It will be 2 years this July since I visited the north of Ireland and had the opportunity to see for myself the violence and the killing associated with the Orange Order marchers in the village of Drumcree. I had the opportunity to stay in Belfast for several days and visited many towns, including Derry. Unfortunately, the situation today looks like a repeat of the past.

Before July, the north of Ireland will host seven parades. While I think that having constructive dialogue concerning the composition and makeup or whether the members are independent and impartial of the Parade Commission is good, it is just not enough. The dismissal and rejection of John Larkin leads me to believe that this body is a unionist commission for the unionist people. How can an apprentice boy, an ex-UDA member, an ex-member of the Policy Authority, be independent and fair? The celebration and victory of William of Orange, in which Irish land was seized and confiscated, is an insult to Catholics everywhere, and today for the parades to go on makes no sense.

Sadly, this parade glorifies a part of history and is provocative in nature. That is why I, along with Members of the Irish Caucus, have written Mo Mowlam urging the British Government to prohibit any marches by any group through any neighborhood in the north of Ireland, especially during the marching season.

When I was there, one could hear gunfire and shooting throughout the city. Police statistics estimated that there were 1,600 rounds of plastic bullets shot during the troubles. The plastic bullets severely maim and injure their victims. They are 3½ inches long and about 1½ inches thick. These are supposed to be used for crowd control, but they can kill, they can maim, they can injure, and young children have been hit with these and have found it to be fatal. My experience there moved me to introduce H.R. 1075, to ban the use of plastic bullets in the north of Ireland.

As we celebrate St. Patrick's Day, let us not forget the hard-working Irish immigrants that built the Delaware and Raritan Canal located in my State of New Jersey. State Senator Dick Codey has introduced a resolution asking the State to appropriate \$50,000 to help build the monument to these great workers. Today, the canal supplies water to 1.2 million residents in central New Jersey. Although best known today for its picturesque scenery where joggers, bikers and fishermen go for recreation, little was known about the Irish laborers that died sometimes while working on the canal. Many of the canal diggers, sometimes using their bare hands, built these channels during the 19th century as the

major link between manufacturers and their markets. There was a cholera epidemic which killed many of these men who were just buried on the side of the canal.

The canal opened in 1834 and quickly became one of the country's busiest navigation canals. New Jersey Governor Peter Vroom made the inaugural voyage at that time from Trenton to New Brunswick where crowds cheered at every bridge and lock.

The Hibernian raised \$1,000 for the headstone to honor the men. Without much fanfare, they dedicated it just before St. Patrick's Day 3 years ago. We are looking forward to seeing this monument built in the State of New Jersey. Let me conclude by saying, as Dr. King said, that "injustice anywhere . . . justice everywhere."

Gerry Adams was born on October 6, 1948 in the working class areas of West Belfast.

Upon finishing school in the 1960's Gerry supported himself as a bartender while becoming increasingly involved in the civil rights movement. Modeled on the civil rights movement in the U.S., the Irish effort was founded to fight discrimination against northern Catholics by the British government in the areas of housing, employment, education and language. The brutal reaction of the Unionist government in the six counties resulted in the ultimate breach of civil rights—murder by the government of peaceful protesters at what has become known as Bloody Sunday. Let's never forget Bloody Sunday, January 30, 1972, a day that will live on in infamy.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this human rights resolution on Northern Ireland, H. Con. Res. 152. The distinguished Chairman of our subcommittee on human rights and international operations, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has done an outstanding job in crafting this resolution. It is highly appropriate that we consider this resolution today, St. Patrick's Day.

The Committee on International Relations has held extensive hearings on human rights and on fair employment in the north of Ireland during 104th, and in this current Congress. This resolution before us embodies many of the key findings and recommendations from those extensive hearings. We took firsthand testimony from many from Northern Ireland on the underlying causes and the troubles there. The need for respect for human rights is an essential element in finding lasting solutions for Northern Ireland. It is very clear from the long and disappointing history of the troubles in Northern Ireland. There have been far too many previous failed attempts at political solutions that neglected this key human rights concern.

The world must no longer neglect the need to promote fundamental respect for human rights and for economic justice in the north of Ireland. The need for fundamental reform, especially in the treatment of the minority nationalist community, must be a strong United States foreign policy priority and goal. Helping to make human rights a centerpiece of the solutions to the long and divisive troubles in the north of Ireland will have a salutary impact on the current search for lasting peace that is now underway in Belfast.

After many years of following very closely and visiting on numerous occasions the north of Ireland, I strongly urge support for this long overdue human rights initiative before our body.

Former Irish President Mary Robinson, now the U.N. High Commissioner for Human Rights, said it best not too long ago while visiting Capitol Hill. Mrs. Robinson made a key point that the adoption of human rights guarantees a very important part of a sustainable peace in Northern Ireland. Father Sean McManus of the Irish national caucus also helped to make clear what is needed and why in stating, "It is a violation of human rights that has been the fundamental cause of the troubles in Northern Ireland." Father Sean should know, for he is a native of Northern Ireland.

Accordingly, I urge adoption of this resolution by all of those concerned about peacefully securing lasting solutions and justice in Northern Ireland.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ).

(Mr. MENENDEZ asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, today is St. Patrick's Day, a day when we celebrate the great tenacity and spirit of the Irish. The color green reminds us of the mystical island, rolling hills and people which captivated St. Patrick. I look forward to the day when the Irish people, Catholic and Protestant alike, can revel in the great treasure that is Ireland without regard to their religious or political affinities.

There is reason to be hopeful. The peace process in Ireland, despite recent setbacks, is moving forward, and the labor government has adopted a more open posture on dialogue with Sinn Fein and has expressed a willingness to reopen the investigation into the events of bloody Sunday.

□ 1630

These are positive developments. However, they cannot and do not mitigate the Congress's concern about the pattern of human rights abuses against the Catholic population in Northern Ireland. History should not inhibit

progress, but we cannot forget the repressive tactics used against the Irish people, from the potato famine to Bloody Sunday to the present day harassment and repression by the Royal Ulster Constabulary and the British system on persons like Colin Duffy. Trust remains something to be won, not given.

After years and years of intransigence and abuse, the Catholic minority is rightfully angry and suspicious. The history and abuse of human rights in Northern Ireland is long and treacherous.

From the confinement of Roisin McAliskey during her pregnancy; the inflammatory marches of the Orange Order, which we have again this year, as Mo Mowlam visits the capital today; that, in fact, the British government will understand the enormous consequences of those marches and the manner in which they have taken place and the potential risks to peace that they generate; the use of plastic bullets; the baseless harassment and imprisonment of persons sympathetic to the Republican cause; and the countless violations of human rights stemming from Britain's emergency legislation which governs the 6 northeast counties in Ireland. The populace of Northern Ireland has suffered myriad abuses of its civil and human rights.

The resolution of these long outstanding issues is necessary to begin the process of reconciliation.

I intend to introduce a separate resolution which endorses the CEARTA, a document drafted in Northern Ireland and endorsed by many Irish groups in the United States. It builds on the idea that there exists a historic opportunity to build peace in Ireland and recognizes that the people living in the north are entitled to the same basic rights as those residing elsewhere in Ireland.

It further calls for an end to the emergency legislation, reform of the legal system, the creation of unarmed and accountable police services, the end to all forms of discrimination, equality for the Irish language and culture, and the release of all political prisoners.

At this time in the marching season, we hope that the British government will have heard the many voices here in the Congress and abroad about the consequences. We hope they change that course of events.

I want to commend my colleague, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for introducing this timely resolution. I urge its adoption.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, let me thank my friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ), for his kind remarks. We are in solidarity on this. I think this is again one of those issues that unites this Chamber.

Let me just close by noting that House Concurrent Resolution 152 puts Congress on record as supporting not

just the peace process, which we all want hostilities to end, but also to put human rights at the core, at the center of those negotiations. It is timely and needed and will help ensure that human rights concerns are in no way overlooked when the final document is produced.

Mr. Speaker, the history of the "Troubles" of Northern Ireland are marked by violent crimes of parliamentary groups and at times by agents of the British government. The failure of the British government to protect the human rights of its citizens, especially Catholics in the north of Ireland, have helped to fuel the violence.

Notwithstanding the abuses perpetrated by partisan paramilitary forces or by the police, for that matter, we must remember that the essential responsibility for protecting rights and maintaining the rule of law belongs to the government which, in this case, at this particular time, is the British government.

When governments resort to methods that are illegal, unjust or inhumane, even when these methods are seemingly directed against the guilty or the dangerous, the effect is not to preserve law and order, but to seriously undermine it. It is particularly saddening that the British government, America's trusted ally, is the object of serious and credible charges of disrespect for the rule of law in the north of Ireland.

All of the major human rights organizations, from Amnesty International to the Lawyers Committee for Human Rights and Human Rights Watch, have been particularly critical of pervasive restrictions on the due process of law in Northern Ireland; and they have testified that law enforcement officials of the UK, members of the Royal Ulster Constabulary, tolerate and even perpetrate some of the gross abuses that have taken place in the north of Ireland.

Under so-called emergency legislation applicable only in Northern Ireland, police have expansive powers to arrest and detain suspects and to search premises without a warrant. In addition, the government can suspend the right to trial by jury, the much-maligned Diploic Courts Systems, and the universally recognized right to be preserved from self-incrimination in like manner has been abridged.

It seems to me that the power to arbitrarily arrest, detain, intimidate, the power to deny timely and appropriate legal counsel, and the power to compel self-incrimination is an abuse of power normally associated with some of our adversaries, not our allies.

Thus, the resolution is a wake-up call to our friends. Friends do not let friends abuse human rights.

Witness after witness, Mr. Speaker, who came into our two hearings expressed a fear that as the political issues are addressed, universal human rights such as the right to silence, the

right to jury trial, the right to attorneys, the right to work free of discrimination will be neglected.

House Concurrent Resolution 152 puts on notice those who are negotiating and says, in a very friendly way but in a very firm way, that the U.S. Congress believes that there must be reform on human rights issues if genuine peace is to be achieved. It also points out that there are many human rights reforms that could be enacted today without waiting for a final peace negotiation.

Among the immediate changes are those proposed by Britain's own standing advisory committee or commission, I should say, on human rights, SACHR, to eliminate religious discrimination against Catholics in the workplace. Other reforms suggested by human rights groups, such as repealing the emergency legislation, conducting independent inquiries into the deaths of Pat Finucane, Robert Hamill and other human rights abuses, and banning plastic bullets, are all doable. If enacted immediately, these changes could help pave the way for further reconciliation, further confidence-building and, hopefully, for a lasting and sustainable peace.

Mr. Speaker, House Concurrent Resolution 152 has been reviewed and has been endorsed by all of the major human rights organizations. It does put us on record as standing foursquare.

Let me just say one final point, Mr. Speaker. In the upcoming weeks we hope to have an additional hearing in our subcommittee that would deal with an issue of very grave concern. That is the issue of defense attorneys in the north of Ireland. We have found, much to my shock and dismay, an ongoing intimidation campaign against those who would defend those who have been accused of wrongdoing in Northern Ireland.

It seems to me that defense attorneys are not unlike those that we stood up for time and time again during the heydays of the Cold War, the Helsinki monitors, people who have stood up and said that due process must be protected. I may not like my client, I may not like what you say they are alleged to have done, but you are not going to intimidate the attorney that is there to defend them, because that would be a breach of due process and of basic human rights.

We are going to be looking at that in the coming weeks in the subcommittee, and hopefully by then this process will be that much further along, and this resolution that is under consideration in Belfast will have a happy conclusion.

I urge Members to support this resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend and the chairman of the subcommittee, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), who has been a tireless fighter for human rights all over the world; certainly in Ireland, but all over the world as well.

I rise in support of House Concurrent Resolution 152. I think it is very fitting that we have this resolution today on St. Patrick's Day.

I have been to Ireland and the north of Ireland a number of times. I have struggled, along with the people there and many of us in Congress for many years, to try to bring peace and justice to the beleaguered people in the north of Ireland.

I think anyone who has visited some of the areas in Northern Ireland, particularly some of the Catholic neighborhoods, really gets a feeling of a people under occupation in Belfast and in Derry and some of the other places. But we can say, Mr. Speaker, that there is some hope. We can say that the atmosphere has improved, so that we hope that there will be an agreement between the parties in the talks led by Senator Mitchell.

I think there are a number of reasons why there is improvement. I think the British government, the current British government under Prime Minister Blair, has gone a great deal of the way in stepping forward, making progress. I think that helps create a better atmosphere. But there is still a long, long way to go.

This resolution, of course, rejects violence, as well we should; and a peace-loving people on both sides have to reject violence. Violence is not the way to act. But we also must understand that human rights must be protected. That is stated clearly in House Concurrent Resolution 152.

We know in the north of Ireland the human rights of people, particularly of the Catholics in the north of Ireland, have not been respected. There has been unemployment, 70 and 80 percent in some areas. There have been a lack of human rights. As I mentioned before, when you go into some of those areas, the bog side in Derry and some of the places in West Belfast, you truly feel that it is a people under occupation. That is wrong.

As the gentleman from New Jersey said, because Britain is our ally we have even more of an obligation to point out some of the shortcomings and some of the things that we wish would change.

So the struggle for peace and justice in Ireland will continue. It has to continue with the United States' participation. That is one of the ways that we can make progress and move forward. I compliment President Clinton for making this a priority, and I compliment the job Senator Mitchell has done.

There need to be a lot of steps taken. We need to have the emergency legislation repealed, and some of the other things taken.

Also, we have an issue here in the United States. There were many, many Irish deportees that do not want to go back to the north of Ireland because they fear for their lives. We were able to get a stay on that. We want the Justice Department to make this stay permanent. It affects at least two of my constituents, and I have circulated letters and have 30 co-signers of the letter calling on the Justice Department not to send these deportees back.

As you say, Mr. Speaker, I think House Concurrent Resolution 152 is the right resolution at the right time. We all pray for peace in the north of Ireland. We pray for peace and justice.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to address a question to the chairman of our Subcommittee on International Operations and Human Rights, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH).

I would ask the gentleman, would he agree with what Father Sean McManus stated in a recent letter dated March 17, today, as a matter of fact, on the cause of some of the problems, the troubles in Ireland?

He said, and I am quoting from his letter, "Inequality is at the heart of the problem in Northern Ireland, and, therefore, equality must be at the heart of the solution. Passing the MacBride Principles into law is a perfect way for our Nation to show its support for the Irish peace process based on nonviolence and equality."

Would the gentleman agree with that?

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GILMAN. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I agree fully with the MacBride Principles, which are patterned after the Sullivan Principles, which were instrumental in eliminating, or very important in the process of eliminating, discrimination in South Africa. They are contained, as we know, in the State Department Conference Report, which will be up tomorrow as part of the fund for Africa.

So I would hope Members would be put on notice that tomorrow, when we do vote on the State Department Conference Report authored by Mr. HELMS, my good friend, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), and myself, that that contains the MacBride Principles, which advance the cause of religious freedom in the north of Ireland.

So I thank the gentleman for asking that question.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from New Jersey for reminding us that that important provision is part of the measure, the State Department authorization measure, which will be on the floor tomorrow.

Mr. Speaker, I include for the RECORD the full letter from Father Sean McManus.

The letter referred to is as follows:

IRISH NATIONAL CAUCUS, INC.,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1998.

Hon. BEN GILMAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN GILMAN: I want to thank you for again enshrining the MacBride Principles in the Foreign Affairs Reform and Restructuring Act.

The MacBride Principles have proven to be the most effective campaign ever against anti-Catholic discrimination in Northern Ireland.

Inequality is at the heart of the problem in Northern Ireland, and, therefore, equality must be at the heart of the solution. Passing the MacBride Principles into law is the perfect way for the U.S. to show its support for the Irish peace process, based on non-violence and equality.

Chairman Gilman, Irish-Americans deeply appreciate your dedicated and outstanding leadership on Irish affairs.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

FR. SEAN MCMANUS,
President.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to briefly point out that it seems that there is virtually unanimity, if not complete unanimity, on the merits of the resolution before us.

It is very pleasing that we can share the fact with the public today that the historic and very delicate and complex all-party talks are progressing in Belfast. These talks will resume next week, with the participation of both Sinn Féin, the major Protestant Unionist Party, and the Ulster Unionists.

I also think it is important to point out that there was a better way to have handled this resolution today. It is appropriate and symbolic to have brought it up on St. Patrick's day; but, unfortunately, this side of the aisle had only a few hours' prior notice that this resolution was even coming up, which deprived us of the opportunity to confirm that the administration had been consulted on this.

The focus here today has been on how well-executed the plan has been in the all-party talks, and depriving us of the opportunity to work with the administration to ensure that that execution continues is an unnecessary risk.

Mr. Speaker, when we violate our own rules, when we circumvent our own process, we make some of our greatest errors. This version of this bill was heard in the Committee on International Relations, wherein lies the expertise of this body on foreign relation matters, which has been so clearly demonstrated today by comments on both sides of the aisle.

So I think it is just important to point out that in the future, when we take up significant matters like this, we really should honor our own process to assure that we produce our very best work.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1645

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. LAZIO).

Mr. LAZIO of New York. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) for his work on this resolution and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the distinguished chairman of the full committee, my colleagues and friends, for their work not just on behalf of this resolution but on behalf of the peace process in Northern Ireland. They have done remarkably good work.

I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152. This is at a particularly timely moment in the peace talks in Northern Ireland. America has strong historic and cultural ties to Ireland. We share a communal heritage and familiar backgrounds. However, with all of our resources we cannot solve this problem for Ireland and Britain. The will of the Irish and British people is the one element in the peace talks that will be the determining factor. At this pivotal moment, the fate of Northern Ireland lies in the hands of those involved in the negotiations. I commend both Bertie Ahern, the Taoiseach of Ireland, British Prime Minister Tony Blair, along with Mo Mowlam, British Secretary for Northern Ireland, John Hume, David Trimble and Gerry Adams for their commitment to working toward a peaceful resolution. I encourage them to seize this historic opportunity to end the violence in Northern Ireland and to put in place a new framework that encourages this end.

I will say that just in speaking to the parties today, being in America, they seem like they have moved closer together. There is better dialogue than ever before. Cultivating that peace process, that dialogue, that positive communication is something that we had been uniquely suitable to do.

The history of Northern Ireland is marked by the events of Bloody Sunday, the hunger strikes and many other tragedies. On this St. Patrick's Day let us renew our commitment to the negotiations and encourage the Irish and British governments to resolve their differences and come to a realistic framework for peace. I understand that when the negotiators return to the table, they will be faced with the Easter deadline. This is indeed a critical moment, but it is also exciting and hopeful and perhaps the very best chance for peace in decades.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Just to conclude, Mr. Speaker, I urge every Member to vote for this resolution. Again it puts us on record supporting not only the peace process, but the all important inclusiveness of the human rights dimension. We do not want it to be a sub or a sidebar issue.

It ought to be a mainstream issue. There is not evidence enough that it has been.

Let me also just say, as I have done in meeting with Mo Mowlam, and I know many of my colleagues have done this in the past, we have all raised specific questions and issues. I raised Sean Kelly and Michael Timmons when I met with her. Our hope is that these two gentlemen and others who find themselves in a similar circumstance or who have been incarcerated because of the common purpose laws, were not convicted of committing a crime but were in proximity to a crime and therefore found themselves getting life sentences for their unfortunate proximity to a heinous act. I met with those two individuals in the Maze prison last year. I was very much impressed. The human rights organizations with whom I have had contact with believe that they are innocent and our hope is that in the spirit of reconciliation and, above all, in the spirit of justice these individuals will find their way to freedom.

We had Sean Kelly's father testify at our hearing and he gave a very persuasive account as to what happened. Again, the human rights organizations have looked at these cases very carefully and have concluded that this has been a miscarriage of justice if ever there was one. So our plea to the government of the United Kingdom would be to let these individuals out. It is a positive step towards reconciliation, but above all it would be a step in the right direction towards peace.

Mrs. KENNELLY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my strong support for House Concurrent Resolution 152 which moves the issue of human rights to the forefront of the peace talks in Northern Ireland. We are at a crossroads in the history of Northern Ireland and have a unique opportunity to finally secure lasting peace in an area that has too often endured violence.

Since 1969, the political violence in Northern Ireland has claimed more than 3,000 lives and resulted in injuries to thousands more. This must finally end and all parties must work together in a democratic, peaceful manner, to ensure that human rights will be respected for all the people of Northern Ireland.

I am encouraged by the leadership of the Irish and British Governments and the efforts of former United States Senator George Mitchell, who have fostered the opportunity for an end to the violence and brought hope for a lasting peace in Northern Ireland.

I urge my colleagues to support this important resolution, and to support an end to the violence and human rights abuses in Northern Ireland.

Mr. MANTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H. Con. Res. 152 and thank my colleague CHRIS SMITH for introducing this important and timely legislation to address human rights in the Northern Ireland peace process.

As a Co-Chair of the Congressional Ad Hoc Committee on Irish Affairs, I have worked closely with my colleagues to ensure a just and lasting peace in Northern Ireland. Nearly 3,000 people have lost their lives through the

political strife that has plagued this community for over 25 years. Today, however, there is hope. With the leadership of former Senator George Mitchell, substantive talks between the British and the Irish governments, along with those representing various political parties, have made landmark progress.

I believe H. Con. Res. 152 sends a clear and strong message to all parties involved in these talks that they must address the central issue to the troubles in Northern Ireland—the denial of basic human rights. We, as Members of Congress, must raise this important issue and continue to demonstrate our support to finding an end to the violence in Northern Ireland.

In order to develop a lasting peace in this region, many of the blatant human rights abuses must come to a stop. The abuses of diplock courts, mistreatment of detainees in Northern Ireland, threats against business owners, and harassment by the police against citizens can simply no longer be accepted or allowed to continue. This legislation addresses these and other human rights abuses and strongly suggests that parties from both sides of the conflict to embrace and practice international human rights standards.

Although the MacBride Principle have had a positive impact on the economic and labor climate in Northern Ireland, Catholic males are still twice as likely as Protestant males to be unemployed. H. Con. Res. 152 encourages leaders in the peace talks to ensure that Catholics have the means necessary to receive the training essential to obtaining a job.

I commend the new leadership in Britain and in Ireland for their efforts on this issue. I believe the movement towards peace will be much swifter as these two governments address the need to reach an agreement on human rights. In addition, I know their leadership, along with that of former Senator George Mitchell, will foster progress and bring political, social and economic stability to Northern Ireland.

Mr. Speaker, thank you for allowing this important human rights measure to come to the floor. I also want to again congratulate my friend and colleague, CHRIS SMITH, for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska). The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 152, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until tomorrow.

CALLING FOR AN END TO VIOLENT REPRESSION OF LEGITIMATE RIGHTS OF PEOPLE OF KOSOVA

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend rules and agree to the concur-

rent resolution (H. Con. Res. 235) calling for an end to the violent repression of the legitimate rights of the people of Kosova, as amended.

The Clerk read as follows:

H. CON. RES. 235

Whereas the Albanian people of Kosova constitute more than 90 percent of the total population of Kosova;

Whereas the political rights of the Albanian people of Kosova were curtailed when the Government of Yugoslavia illegally amended the Constitution of Yugoslavia without the consent of the people of Kosova on March 23, 1989, revoking the autonomous status of Kosova;

Whereas in 1990, the Parliament and Government of Kosova were abolished by further unlawful amendments to the Constitution of Yugoslavia;

Whereas the Mission of Long Duration to Kosova, the Sandzak and Vojvodina, which the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) deployed in 1992, eased local tensions through objective human rights monitoring and facilitating dialogue between authorities and the various communities before the authorities of Serbia-Montenegro expelled the Mission in 1993;

Whereas the State Department's 1997 Country Report on Human Rights in Serbia notes violations of civil liberties in Kosova particularly in the following categories: political and other extra-judicial killing; torture and other cruel inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment; arbitrary arrest, detention or exile; denial of fair public trial; and arbitrary interference with privacy, family, home, or correspondence;

Whereas on the night of February 28, 1998, Serbian paramilitary policy units, reported to number in excess of 25,000 men, swept through the Drenica region of Kosova killing more than 20 Albanian citizens, many of who died from being beaten to death;

Whereas on March 2, 1998, 30,000 demonstrators peacefully marched in Pristina to protest the massacre of February 28 and were brutally attacked by Serbian police;

Whereas a group calling itself the Liberation Army of Kosova has threatened to retaliate against the atrocities committed by Serbian authorities;

Whereas new elections in Kosova scheduled for March 22, 1998, have now been postponed; and

Whereas the President of the United States and other officials have warned the Government of Serbia that there would be serious consequences if Serbian policies led to an escalation of violence in Kosova: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That it is the sense of the Congress that—

(1) the violent repression carried out by the Serbian police and paramilitary forces against the ethnic Albanian population of Kosova should be condemned by the United States and the international community;

(2) efforts of the international Contact Group (the United States, United Kingdom, France, Germany, Russia, and Italy) in support of a resolution of the conflict in Kosova are to be commended and intensified;

(3) no international or United States sanctions currently in force against the Government of Serbia and Montenegro should be terminated at this time, unless such termination serves to support a peaceful resolution to the repression in Kosova;

(4) the United States should consult with its allies and other members of the United Nations on reimposing those sanctions against Serbia-Montenegro that were terminated following the signing of the Dayton Peace Agreement in 1995 if Serbian authori-

ties continue to use unlawful violence against the Albanian people of Kosova;

(5) the United States should acknowledge recent developments in the Republic of Montenegro that indicate that the new leadership of the Republic is seeking a peaceful resolution to the repression in Kosova, particularly the statement by Montenegrin President Milo Djukanovic that Kosova must receive a certain degree of autonomy, and his call for a dialog between the Government of Serbia and Montenegro and ethnic Albanians in Kosova;

(6) the United States should, to the extent practicable, recognize positive actions by the Government of the Republic of Montenegro with regard to repression in Kosova through exclusion from those sanctions that may be applied to the Government of Serbia;

(7) the elections in Kosova originally scheduled for March 22, 1998, and now postponed, should be allowed to proceed unimpeded by Belgrade whenever they take place, as they represent the opportunity for a peaceful expression of the political will of the Albanian people of Kosova;

(8) all parties should refrain from acts that could lead to heightened tensions in Kosova;

(9) international and nongovernmental organizations that provide medical assistance should be permitted immediate and unrestricted access to Kosova and all of its citizens;

(10) international investigators of serious breaches of international humanitarian law should be granted immediate and unimpeded access to all parts of Kosova and to its citizens;

(11) the agreement on education in Kosova should be implemented immediately, including at the university level, allowing all residents of Kosova regardless of ethnicity to receive education in their native tongue;

(12) the elected leaders of Kosova should begin a dialog without preconditions with the authorities in Belgrade to resolve the present situation, and to provide for the exercise of the legitimate civil and political rights of all the people of Kosova;

(13) inasmuch as the Belgrade regime led by the last Communist dictator in Europe, Slobodan Milosevic, continues to abuse democratic norms and the rights of all its citizens, threatening general regional stability, the United States should undertake determined measures and provisions designed to promote human rights and democratic government throughout Serbia and Montenegro;

(14) the authorities of Serbia-Montenegro should cooperate fully with efforts and initiatives of the Organization for Security and Cooperation in Europe (OSCE) to address the problems in Kosova, including the immediate and unconditional return of a Mission of Long Duration;

(15) staff of the United States Information Agency office in Pristina, Kosova, should be augmented; and

(16) the United Nations Security Council should consider the question of restoration of the human and political rights of the people of Kosova and actions to halt Belgrade's violent repression of the region's population.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN) and the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS), each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN).

(Mr. GILMAN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks the world has witnessed the horrifying spectacle of violence again sweeping a part of the Balkans. Serbian paramilitary police forces brutally assaulted the long suffering people of the province of Kosova, more than 90 percent of whom are Albanian. Whole villages were attacked and their inhabitants were forced to flee into the hills. Entire families were massacred as Serbian forces fired indiscriminately into their homes.

When the Kosovars gathered peacefully to protest these atrocities, Serbian police met them with more brutality, first firing on the marchers with tear gas and water cannon, then beating anyone who came within reach.

It should be noted that the terrible war that destroyed the former Yugoslavia began in 1989 in Kosova, when dictator Slobodan Milosevic arbitrarily and illegally terminated the autonomous status enjoyed by Kosova under the Constitution of the former Yugoslavia.

The international community and our government in particular has repeatedly warned Milosevic of severe consequences should he be responsible for further violence in Kosova, where his government has forced ethnic Albanians from their jobs, from their classrooms and from their communities. He has apparently decided to ignore all these warnings. Using as a pretext the emergence of a group calling itself the Kosova Liberation Army, or UCK as it is known in Albania, Milosevic has ratcheted up his policy of making the lives of the majority of Kosovars a living hell through repression and brutality.

It is with the deepest concern that I introduce this measure now before us, H. Con. Res. 235, calling for an end to the violent repression of the legitimate rights of the Albanian people of Kosova. I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) for joining with me in introducing this measure.

With this resolution, Congress places on the record its concern over the worsening situation in Kosova and points to constructive measures that could lead to an improvement. In particular, the resolution urges all parties to refrain from violence. I fully understand and sympathize with the growing frustration of the Albanian citizens of Kosova who have peacefully resisted the repressive Milosevic regime for more than 10 years. However, that violence can only beget further violence in Kosova. Only through dialogue between the democratic leaders of the Kosovars and the regime in Belgrade can the situation be peacefully resolved.

It is in the interest of our Nation to do whatever we can to encourage a beginning of such a dialogue immediately and without any preconditions because there must also be some redress for the victims of violence and their families. The international community must be

able to investigate any reports of violations of international law that would fall within the purview of the International Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia.

That is why this resolution calls for immediate access for international investigators as well as for organizations that can provide medical assistance to those who have been wounded. Hopefully, this resolution will assist the efforts of our Secretary Madeline Albright, Ambassador Gelbard and other diplomats to make clear to Milosevic and to the Serbian authorities that we view their actions with abhorrence and disgust and that we insist on the speedy and peaceful resolution of the problems in Kosova. We cannot and will not tolerate another Bosnia in the Balkans.

Accordingly, I urge my colleagues to send an important message to Belgrade by supporting H. Con. Res. 235.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks on House Concurrent Resolution 235.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), one of the leading cosponsors of this concurrent resolution.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I was very happy to play a major role in writing this legislation. I want to thank my colleague from New York, the distinguished chairman of the committee, for introducing this legislation along with me.

We have reached a very important time in the region of Kosova. There are 2 million ethnic Albanians living there under Serb occupation and tyranny. We saw the extent of that tyranny, as the chairman mentioned, a couple of weeks ago when women, children and innocent people were just wantonly killed by Serbian police using helicopters and artillery. It was something that we ought not to see in the year 1998. It brought us back to the beginning of Bosnia and Bosnia, of course, is when the West did not object strongly enough and did not take strong measures early enough that we saw the tragedy in Bosnia with thousands upon thousands of people being killed in ethnic cleansing and genocide. We can see the same thing happening in Kosova if the world does not take a strong stand now.

This resolution, H. Con. Res. 235, is an attempt by this Congress to take a strong stand because we know that if the situation is going to be resolved in Kosova, it can only be resolved with the United States taking a very, very strong stand.

I have been to Kosova a number of times. I intend to go again either later this week or later sometime this year. I think it is very, very important that the United States stand up strongly for the rights of people for self-determination and freedom all over the world.

As chairman of the Albanian Issues Caucus, we have been talking. I have been talking about Kosova for many, many years and saying that a flare up like this could make Bosnia almost seem like a tea party, regrettably, compared to what could happen in Kosova. When you have 2 million ethnic Albanians, 90 percent of the population with no economic rights, with no political rights, with no human rights, you are bound to have a flare up. And for too many years Milosevic, leader of Serbia, has refused to even discuss these things with the Albanians in Kosova. He summarily took away their autonomy back in 1998. Some people are now saying let's go back to autonomy. Why would the Albanians want to go back into a situation that failed 10 years ago, that was summarily stolen from them 10 years ago. In the old Yugoslavia you had counterbalances to the Serbs. You had the Croats and the Bosnians and the Macedonians, the Slovenians, and it was not so dominated by the Serbs. Today in Serbia or Yugoslavia it is so Serb-dominated they have not given any freedoms at all to the Albanian citizens. Why would the Albanians want to go back into this situation?

So we have elections scheduled for later on this week. It is a little bit uncertain as to whether those elections will be held, but the people of Kosova must be allowed to express their desire in open and free elections. They must be allowed to elect their leaders and their parliament, which they did 6 years ago, and then they were not allowed to meet. So for 6 years there has not been any meeting of the Albanian parliament duly elected by the people of Kosova. This cannot continue. This must not continue.

What this resolution does is it condemns Belgrade's brutal crackdown in Kosova; again, the killing of innocent men, women and children. It calls for the maintenance of the current sanctions against the Belgrade regime and consideration of restoring the interwall of sanctions. If Milosevic does not do what he is being asked to do, which is to give basic freedom to people, we ought to consider slapping new sanctions on them. This supports the elections process in Kosova and sending monitors, and it is very, very important that we have monitors. It demands the full implementation of the education agreement, including at the university level. Again, Albanians cannot teach in their language, they cannot go to schools. It is just impossible.

I want to commend the Albanian students in Kosova. Their peaceful demonstrations have shown a tremendous level of maturity and must be supported by all freedom loving people

around the world. This resolution also urges the U.N. Security Council to discuss Kosova, as well they should. This is a very, very important international incident and Kosova ought to be discussed by the Security Council. It calls for the return of the OSCE monitors, which were thrown away by Milosevic, who will not allow international monitoring. We need international monitoring on the ground if we are to prevent a tragedy in Kosova. It encourages the expansion of the USIA office. I was proud to go there 2 years ago, to Pristina, the capital, and cut the ribbon for the United States information office. We ought to expand that office to show that we as a Nation are engaged, that the Albanians there know there is a friend in the United States, that the Serbs and Belgrade understand that we have a presence there where the American flag is flying and we care very much about what happens on the ground. And the European Union has just recommitted to opening their office in Pristina. They should do it as soon as possible.

□ 1700

In short, Mr. Speaker, what this resolution does, H. Con. Res. 235, is simply reinforce the goals which we hold dear as Americans; the right of self-determination, a condemnation of a brutal crackdown, and saying that the United States of America stands with the Albanian citizens of Kosova because it is right to stand with them. It is right to say that they ought to have the freedoms. It is wrong for them to have no personal freedoms, to have 80 percent or more unemployment, to never have a chance to go to schools. This situation must end.

And what the Congress is attempting to do here in a bipartisan fashion is to say no more brutal crackdowns. This must be condemned by the world, and we want to see the right of self-determination. I would go one step further. I would implement a no-fly zone and continue to do different things that we must have in order to show our solidarity with the people of Kosova.

But this resolution, I think, strikes the right balance at the right time, and I urge my colleagues to support the people of Kosova who are crying out for our help. We can do this, my colleagues, by voting unanimously for H. Con. Res. 235.

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from California (Mr. CUNNINGHAM).

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, let me give a little different perspective. I do not disagree with my colleagues, but I would add maybe some enlightening information.

First of all, during World War II, it was the Serbs that fought with the Allies and the United States. I attended a dinner, a banquet of some 400 Allied and U.S. Air Force pilots that were giving their thanks to the Serbs for getting them behind and through the Cro-

atian and the Muslim lines that fought with Nazi Germany.

I feel that in most cases during the conflict in the former Yugoslavia that the Serbs have been pointed out, maimed and not given equal treatment. I do not want special recognition, but I ask for a more evenhanded look at the Serbians in this conflict.

I do not think there will be peace in the Middle East in my lifetime, nor do I think there will be peace in the former Yugoslavia in my lifetime, but most certainly until we get rid of Milosevic, until we get rid of Izetbegovic, until we get rid of Tudjman, to me, this is the main problem. We need new leadership, we need youth, and we need a new direction for that to go.

If we want a real resolution, let us stop arming the Muslims that are tending to go further and further toward Iran and Iraq and surrounding themselves with the mujahedin out of both Iran, Iraq and Afghanistan. If we want to look at a real potential for the future, when we do end up pulling out, it is not going to be the Serbs coming after the Croats or the Muslims, it is going to be the Muslims coming out for the Croats and the Serbs if we continue with that.

I commend the gentlemen, but I would like to see more of an evenhanded approach. If this opens up for investigation into looking at the allegations, then it is good. But if it is just chastising one group over the other again, as it has in the past, then I do not think it is so good. So I will take a look at the resolution, and I thank the gentleman for the time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. LAMPSON).

Mr. LAMPSON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Yesterday in, Galveston, Texas, I was visited by one of my constituents, Lisa Halili, who brought about 15 other people along with her, many of whom had relatives and certainly had friends in Kosova. The story that they proceeded to tell me was one that was absolutely amazing.

The pictures that they brought of the murder of Lisa's father-in-law last week in Kosova and the pictures of people who had been tortured, who have been butchered, have been sprayed with hot water, all while they were attempting to do peaceful demonstrations by carrying bread in their hands and by holding their fingers up in a symbol for peace, and then being attacked in the way that they have was something that I had a difficult time understanding. I do not understand how we could in any way stand by while people are injured and killed for participating in a non-violent protest.

The Serbian Government must acknowledge the basic civil rights of all of their citizens. This bill condemns the violent repression of ethnic Albanians in Kosova by Serbian authorities

and calls for a dialogue between the Serbian Government and the leaders of the ethnic Albanians in Kosova to end violence by all parties.

So I, too, join my colleagues in asking for an "aye" vote on this bill, but I would also ask that we might, as soon as possible, consider sending humanitarian aid in to these people, because I know now that there are other relatives of my own constituents in the Ninth District of Texas who are holed up in houses, fearful of being able to go out even in search for the medical attention that they need to treat the wounds that they presently have. They are able to get out or get messages out so that other relatives can call back here, and we are receiving word on a daily basis of the condition of these people, but it is unquestionably deteriorating.

As soon as possible, the Red Cross must be allowed in with safe passage as well.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution and commend the chairman of the committee and the ranking member for their leadership on this issue.

I regret that the gentleman from California has left the floor.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things that made me nervous, very frankly, during the Cold War, was some well-meaning Members used to get up and draw parallels between Soviet actions and perceived problems in the United States. There was no parallelism or comparison to be drawn. And the gentleman from California that tries to draw a parallelism between the Muslims and Mr. Izetbegovic and the Croats and the Serbs, I would, with all due respect to the gentleman from California, strongly disagree.

President Reagan saw evil, and he called it evil. That was what it should have been, in my opinion, Mr. Speaker. Milosevic is evil. I do not come to this floor for a brief on Mr. Tudjman or Mr. Izetbegovic, but I see no parallel between the war crimes sanctioned by, led by and committed by Mr. Milosevic and the other two.

The fact of the matter, Mr. Speaker, is once again the butcher of Belgrade has struck, and the victims are his own citizens. Sadly, Mr. Speaker, we should not be surprised. This is a conflict that has been simmering for a long, long time; some would say centuries.

The new Chairman of the OSCE, Foreign Minister Bronislaw Geremek of Poland, in mid-February, just 30 days ago, referred to the situation in Kosova as, and I quote, a conflict in preparation.

As many of my colleagues know, Kosova has been overshadowed for some years by the conflict in Bosnia. Preoccupation with Bosnia, in fact,

contributed to the maintenance of the status quo in Kosovo, especially since there was a strong chance early on for the Bosnian conflict to have a spillover effect on nearby regions.

Like a number of my colleagues, I have been to Pristina, the capital of Kosovo. I have talked to Kosovars, but, more importantly, I have talked to Milosevic's hand-picked representative in Pristina. And I asked that representative, "Is there one person, just one, one Kosovar, out of the 90 percent Albanian population in Kosovo, just one that you think is reasonable enough to sit down at the table with and discuss the resolution of the conflicts that exist in Kosovo?" That representative of Mr. Milosevic could not think of one name in all of Kosovo that would be an appropriate interlocutor for peaceful discussions of the resolution of conflicts. Is it any wonder, therefore, that conflict has not been resolved, if one side could not find one person with whom to discuss reasonable resolution?

The recent violence has shattered this status quo, and we are now faced with a possibility of further violence in Kosovo which could spill over into neighboring Macedonia and, indeed, Albania itself. Clearly, Slobodan Milosevic has fomented hatred between the people of the former Yugoslavia as a means to maintain power and ward off democratic development in Serbia itself.

In 1989, as has been said by my friend from New York, whose leadership has been so outstanding on this issue, Milosevic unilaterally and illegally revoked Kosovo's previous autonomy. He made discrimination against ethnic Albanians, who constitute 90 percent of the population of Kosovo, official policy. Discrimination was and is now official policy of the government in Belgrade.

He has repressed freedom of speech, and his police force has arbitrarily harassed, detained, tortured and, yes, even murdered innocent Albanians on a regular basis. The recent massive attacks by Serbian police and paramilitary units are said to be in response to the formation of the Kosovo Liberation Army, which seeks to fight repression with terrorism.

Mr. Speaker, terrorism in any form must be condemned loudly and unequivocally. Violence by either sides will only beget more violence. That said, however, the magnitude of the response by the Serbian authorities is reprehensible. The attacks on several Albanian villages, which left dozens dead, including women and children, and many others injured or displaced, is an absolute and undeniable contravention of the standard for the behavior of governments, as stated in Helsinki Final Act and numerous United Nations documents. They are to be condemned, and those responsible must face consequences.

Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls for the maintenance of sanctions against the Government of Serbia, the reestab-

lishment of the OSCE mission, and the immediate implementation of the agreement on education.

I also support the contact group's call for the prosecution of war criminals, war criminals present in Yugoslavia, not just by definition of us on the floor, but of our own State Department under the Bush administration and under this administration. Mr. Speaker, I believe what has happened in Kosovo constitutes crimes against humanity, and the Hague-based tribunal should have authority to prosecute.

Finally, I agree with the contact group's recommendation of an adaption of the mandate for UNPREDEP, the U.N. peacekeeping force in neighboring Macedonia, which has, as we know, a U.S. contingent. If Kosovo explodes, its potential for direct spillover into neighboring countries is actually greater than it was for Bosnia, and we must be prepared for that threat.

Mr. Speaker, given our witness to the horrors which took place in Bosnia, we should be aware of the dangers in Kosovo, and we must not fail to act.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from New York (Mr. NADLER).

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time, and I rise to support this resolution and to condemn thoroughly the brutal acts of repression and of murder that have occurred recently in Kosovo.

Last month Serbian paramilitary police units swept through Kosovo and killed dozens of ethnic Albanians. Many people were brutally beaten to death. Then, on March 2nd, during a peaceful protest against this massacre, Serbian police again attacked about 30,000 Kosovo residents.

□ 1715

This is an outrage. The actions of the Serbian government warn us that ethnic hatred still threatens to erupt into genocide. They must halt these actions immediately, and they must take concrete steps to ensure that this type of violent police oppression will never occur again.

Unfortunately, Slobodan Milosevic has made discrimination against ethnic Albanians official policy. He has made ethnic hatred and ethnic slaughter official policy in a fashion not seen in Europe since the Nazis.

We had ample warning that this brutality would happen. The State Department on Human Rights stated that "political violence, including killing by police, resulted mostly from efforts by Serbian authorities to suppress and intimidate ethnic minority groups." It went on to report that police repression continues to be directed against ethnic minorities, and police committed the most widespread and worst abuses against Kosovo's 90 percent ethnic Albanian population.

All of this was reported before the most recent incidents of this year. So we must act swiftly and firmly. The

Serbian authorities must not be allowed to get away with these atrocities.

The work of the International Contact Group ought to be commended, but it must be intensified. They ought to make very clear to the government in Belgrade that another round of ethnic cleansing and of ethnic murder will not be tolerated.

International war crimes investigators and organizations providing medical assistance must have immediate and unfettered access to the people of Kosovo. International observers supported by the contact group must establish a presence in Kosovo and maintain constant vigilance against further Serbian abuses.

We must impose tougher sanctions against Serbia, and we must maintain an arms embargo against this brutal regime. We cannot sit idly by while the butchers in Belgrade use violence and oppression to maintain their political power.

We cannot allow the bloodshed and destruction that occurred in Bosnia to begin all over again in Kosovo. We cannot allow this violence to escalate and spread into neighboring nations and result possibly in a general war.

The elections scheduled in Kosovo should be allowed to proceed unimpeded by Belgrade, and the elected leaders who will be elected in Kosovo should begin a dialogue with the Belgrade authorities in an attempt to resolve the situation without violence.

These are just a few of the steps that must be taken in order to prevent further bloodshed and oppression.

Unfortunately, we have not acted soon enough to address these obvious and persistent abuses and murderous actions by Serbia, and today dozens of people are dead because of international indifference. The time to act officially is now. We must not waste any more time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

(Mr. SMITH of New Jersey asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the resolution, H. Con. Res. 235, calling for an end to the violent repression of the legitimate rights of the people of Kosovo. In recent weeks we have seen yet another outbreak of deadly violence in the Balkans, with the Serbian police and the military units striking certain regions in Kosovo and killing as many as 80 Kosovar Albanians.

I am an original cosponsor of the resolution, and I appreciate very much the work done by my colleagues, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from New York (Mr. GILMAN), the chairman of the full committee, to bring this measure to the floor. The measure was considered in committee last week, at which time a number of amendments that I offered

were adopted, including one asking that the OSCE mission be allowed back into Kosovo as soon as possible.

Mr. Speaker, we must all recognize that, despite the complexity of the Balkans, primary responsibility for nearly a decade of conflict in the former Yugoslavia lies squarely on the shoulders of Milosevic and his regime in Belgrade. Since 1989, when Milosevic unilaterally revoked Kosovo's autonomy, he has established as official policy discrimination against ethnic Albanians, who constitute 90 percent of the population of Kosovo, especially in terms of employment. Milosevic's police force in Kosovo is, in reality, more of an army, which has arbitrarily harassed, detained, tortured and even murdered innocent Albanians on a regular basis.

Tomorrow, in fact, the Commission on Security and Cooperation in Europe, which I co-chair, will be conducting a hearing on the issue of the repression and the violence in Kosovo. As the Commission has followed closely this situation in Kosovo, it has become clear that Mr. Milosevic responds to criticism only when there is a clear resolve that his aggression, violence, and abuse of human rights will invoke serious consequences.

I would note that the language of the resolution states that no independent national or United States sanctions currently in force against the Government of Serbia or Montenegro should be terminated at this time unless a judgment is made that such termination would help encourage a peaceful resolution to the repression in Kosovo.

In this resolution, we call on the authorities of Serbia-Montenegro to fully cooperate with efforts and initiatives of the OSCE, including the immediate and unconditional return of a mission of long duration. The mission mandate should focus on all of Serbia and Montenegro and should be held by a person of prominence.

Belgrade expelled the mission, you might recall, Mr. Speaker, in 1993 and has made its return contingent on the lifting of Yugoslavia's suspension in the OSCE. Both Kosovar Albanians and Kosovar Serbs have told us that the return of the mission is desirable. The mission would monitor the situation both in Kosovo and in Serbia and Montenegro and would facilitate local dialogue in order to help deter an escalation of conflict and the violation of human rights.

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that we should enthusiastically support the investigation and prosecution of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia of crimes against humanity committed in Kosovo. The events in Kosovo in recent days are reminiscent of what took place at the beginning of the Bosnian conflict in 1992, and they could similarly escalate into massive and violent ethnic cleansing.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good resolution.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguish gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN).

(Mr. LEVIN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this resolution. There is no defense to the massacre of 80 ethnic Albanians in Kosovo, innocent men, women and children. There are not two sides to this story of murder. Ethnic cleansing is evil, pure and simple. This is not an internal affair of Serbia. This could spill over into other places.

When I was co-chair of the Congressional Delegation that went to Belgrade a few years ago, we told Mr. Milosevic very clearly we would hold him responsible for his actions. This resolution does exactly that.

I remember the faces of people in Sarajevo that war, conflict and death might be over. And now the Serbs have brought destruction and death to Kosovo. We raise our voices to say to the Serbian government, no more. This resolution should be passed unanimously by this body.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to my friend, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. MORAN).

Mr. MORAN of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague and friend, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH), for yielding; and I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle.

We are in agreement on this. This needs to be done. The whole free world needs to react to the brutality that is occurring in Kosovo.

Kosovo is a nation of 2 million people. They voted 7 years ago for independence status, along with their sister republics in Yugoslavia, Slovenia, Macedonia, Bosnia and Croatia. They were denied it even though they voted overwhelmingly for this status.

Slobodan Milosevic is only supported by 5 percent of the population, but yet he reacted to this vote with unprecedented brutality. Repression, beatings, murders, rapes go on constantly, many of them for the purpose of intimidating the population.

There are 60,000 Serb police, paramilitary and military forces that exercise complete control over 2 million Albanian Muslim Kosovars. It is wrong. It is unbelievable that this situation exists at the end of the 20th century.

When I was over in Kosovo, I saw the hospitals, the clinics closed, schools closed, physicians dismissed, businesses summarily closed by the Serb police. In fact, when the OSCE monitors were driven out of the country, the incidence of brutality and human rights violations increased 85 percent.

This was all monitored by a Council for the Defense of Human Rights and Freedoms that we met with in Pristina. Yet, when we met with them that very week, Serbian police had gone into their office and beaten them.

Serbian police stole the photographs, the records that they had. When their attorney attempted to protest to the court, he opened his door that night and was bludgeoned on the head for protesting.

In this country, attorneys for the defense go to court. In Kosovo, they go to the hospital.

This is wrong. This is intolerable, what is existing. These people only want freedom. They want the opportunity to protect themselves and to exercise their most basic human rights.

We saw in one school where the Serbian government, through the police, had taken over half of the school that was supposed to be available for 1,000 children. There were a hundred or so Serbian children using half of it because they were Serbian, and there are almost 1,000 children limited to the other half of the school only because they were Muslim children. And they had bricked over some of the bathrooms.

One of the parents protested at this cruelty toward young children. And because he protested, because he had two young daughters in that school, he was mutilated, cut open from head to groin, and dumped on the doorstep of his family. This is the kind of thing that has given rise to the protests we read about today.

The OSCE human rights monitors need to be monitoring human rights violations. 90% of the population needs to be enfranchised—legally politically and economically. We will not have peace in the Balkans until their is justice in Kosovo.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida (Mr. DAVIS) has 1 minute remaining. The gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) has 7½ minutes remaining.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to urge my colleagues to support this resolution for the reasons that have been so eloquently expressed here today on the floor by both sides.

This resolution rightly calls for an end to the violent repression in Kosovo and for the beginning of a necessary dialogue between the Serb authorities and the leaders that will contribute to the return of legitimate civil and political rights for all the people there.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to comment on the current crisis in Kosovo. The recent death of four policemen and 25 Albanians—followed by the March 5 assault of Serbian forces against ethnic Kosovar Albanians—has marked a new stage in the Balkan crisis. The crackdown in Kosovo, the southernmost province of Serbia, has escalated the conflict between ethnic Albanians and the Serb leadership in Belgrade. Kosovo is home to an estimated 2 million ethnic Albanians and fewer than 200,000 Serbs. Old ethnic rivalries and tensions are running high in Kosovo.

Mr. Speaker, the United States and its allies need to take concrete steps to ensure that this

latest round of violence in the Balkans does not spread to Albania, Macedonia, Greece and perhaps Turkey. We should take proactive steps by learning from recent history. We must encourage a meaningful dialogue between Serbs and Kosovar Albanian leaders that leads to peaceful solutions and protects basic human rights.

Mr. Speaker, the State Department has said that it supports "an enhanced status for Kosovo within the context of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia [Serbia/Montenegro]." Our position is clearly a step in the right direction. It is responsible; it demonstrates our commitment to a peaceful resolution to the conflict; and it underpins our commitment to basic human rights.

One of the deplorable legacies of the Bosnian war is that human rights will be violated if the international community sits back and allows for abuses to happen. We go on record today stating that we will not tolerate abuses and violence. It is wrong, and it is absurd.

The 1995 Dayton Peace Accords clearly demonstrate that peace won't happen without considerable U.S. leadership. In fact, British Foreign Secretary Robin Cook recently met with Yugoslav President Slobodan Milosevic on the issue of greater autonomy for ethnic Albanians, and his comments are instructive: "I did not feel encouraged to believe that there is yet a recognition in Belgrade that there will have to be significant further steps of increased autonomy to Kosovo if we are to find an acceptable political solution (*Washington Post*, March 6, 1998)."

To this end, the political leadership of the ethnic Albanian majority in Kosovo has sought greater independence and freedom from Serb authorities since the early 1990s, but Serbia has flatly rejected the idea. Serbs see Albania as their cultural homeland. It is fitting that we respect and appreciate the Serbs' history but, at the same time, we must take steps to facilitate greater self-governance for ethnic Albanians. They comprise at least 90% of Kosovo's 2 million people. For me the message is clear: the U.S. must support fundamental human rights in the Serbian province of Kosovo. The ethnic Albanians deserve an enhanced political status and a heightened degree of autonomy. Again, autonomy, in a word, could be an antidote for further violence and bloodshed in the region.

Mr. Speaker, writing in Sunday's *Washington Post*, columnist Jim Hoagland helps policy makers return to key principles in this malaise we call the post-Cold War world. He reminds us of the value of human dignity and our fight for human rights. Hoagland reminds us that the "demographic laws of gravity" cannot be defied:

Washington should cease paying tribute to territorial integrity maintained by brute force, whether that force is exercised in Serbia, Iraq, Indonesia or China. The United States should stop opposing in word and deed the aspirations of Kosovars, Kurds, Timorese or Tibetans willing to fight oppression visited on them by other dominant ethnic groups that have a monopoly on firepower and organized violence. . . . Big government in the form of nation-state superstructures like the Soviet Union and Yugoslavia, and big racial ideology in the form of pan-Slavism and pan-Arabism, have been tossed on history's ash heap in this decade. It is a time when the center does not hold, especially in places like the Balkans, "when atomization is the dominant force in international politics."

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support H. Con. Res. 235 that calls for an end to violent repression in Kosovo. Most of all, I ask my colleagues to take a stand for basic human rights and the inviolability of human dignity.

Mr. BONIOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this resolution to condemn the violent repression of the people of Kosova, and I comment my colleagues—Mr. GILMAN and Mr. ENGEL—for their leadership on this issue.

Over the past several weeks we have all seen the horrible images and listened to the cries of grief and outrage.

Those who were executed by the Serbian forces in front of their families last week have now been properly buried.

We mourn them, and extend our deepest condolences to the loved ones who survive them.

It is hard to fathom the cruelty of men who would randomly shoot people, proudly display their lifeless bodies like trophies, then bury them in a ditch.

But that is what we have seen.

It is hard to comprehend how such terrible hatred can so overwhelm a person, that it empties them of all compassion and humanity.

But that is what we have seen.

And it is also hard to understand how a people so brutalized can hang on to hope and keep going. But the ethnic Albanians of Kosova will prevail.

For nine years, Serbia has repressed and harassed them. Now this campaign of terror has degenerated into open slaughter, and many innocent people have died.

Today we join together to say: "No More."

This violence cannot continue, and we must do whatever it takes to stop the bloodshed.

Serbian aggression in Bosnia has taught all of us a hard lesson: that the United States and its allies cannot simply remain on the sidelines.

We brought peace to Bosnia only after we showed Slobodan Milosevic (pronounced Slow-buh-dahn Mill-oh-so-vitch) that his brute force would be countered with swift and decisive military action.

Now Milosevic must accept that he faces the same consequences if he does not halt his campaign of terror in Kosova.

Milosevic must also recognize the legitimate will of the people of Kosova for a free and independent state.

It's been said that you can bury the dead, but you can never bury a dream. Their dream of freedom is stronger than ever, and we stand with them today.

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this resolution. I wish I could say that Serbia's repression of Kosova comes as a surprise but I think we saw it coming by Slobodan Milosevic's aggression in the region.

If dialogue is to happen between the Serbs and the ethnic Albanians, then we must stop sending mixed messages and signals. Let me say that I think that we were too quick to reward Belgrade for its positive steps in Bosnia peace process without taking into consideration what was going on in Kosova.

One of the greatest fears is a spill over into Macedonia which would be terrible for many reasons [Greece and

Turkey] not just geo-strategic ones. I wish I had been here to ask Robert Gelbard about what seems to be the approval of the 700 man extension of the UN peacekeeping force in Macedonia—UNPREDEP (Unpred)—which was due to withdraw this summer.

I know that the election scheduled for March 22 was cancelled especially after the slaughter of 84 people. I understand that Robert Gelbard, in a private meeting with Milosevic, asked just for the families to see the victims bodies before they were buried. Even while Gelbard was boarding the plane, Serbia proceeded with the burial against the wishes of those that were mourning. In addition, let me say that when one side is really serious about talks they at least inform the other side of an agenda, time and place of the meetings.

Ethnic cleansing and massacres cannot be tolerated whether in Rwanda, Bosnia or another Serbian enclave—Kosova. In response to the recent attacks, I along with other members of the Albanian caucus, have sent a letter to the President to address the deteriorating situation in Kosova. In conclusion, Kosova reminds me of the Tiananmen Square incident. Years later, we are still going on with "business as usual." I hope Pristina [Prissstina] won't fall victim to this type of policy.

Mr. DAVIS of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the concurrent resolution, House Concurrent Resolution 235, as amended.

The question was taken.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule I and the Chair's prior announcement, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed until tomorrow.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to revise and extend their remarks on the concurrent resolution just considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5, rule 1, the Chair will now put the question on

the Speaker's approval of the Journal and then two motions to suspend the rules on which further proceedings were postponed earlier today in the order in which that motion was entertained.

Votes will be taken in the following order: approval of the Journal de novo, House Resolution 364 by the yeas and nays, and House Resolution 361 by the yeas and nays.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 5 of rule 1 the pending business is the question of agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal of the last day's proceedings.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently, a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 359, nays 38, not voting 33, as follows:

[Roll No. 53]

YEAS—359

Abercrombie	Cardin	Everett
Ackerman	Carson	Ewing
Aderholt	Castle	Farr
Allen	Chabot	Fattah
Archer	Chambliss	Foley
Army	Chenoweth	Forbes
Bachus	Christensen	Ford
Baesler	Clayton	Fossella
Baker	Clement	Fowler
Baldacci	Coble	Frank (MA)
Ballenger	Coburn	Franks (NJ)
Barcia	Collins	Frelinghuysen
Barr	Combest	Frost
Barrett (NE)	Condit	Furse
Barrett (WI)	Conyers	Gallegly
Bartlett	Cook	Ganske
Barton	Cooksey	Gejdenson
Bass	Cox	Gekas
Bateman	Coyne	Gephardt
Bentsen	Cramer	Gibbons
Bereuter	Crapo	Gilchrest
Berman	Cubin	Gilman
Berry	Cummings	Goode
Bilirakis	Cunningham	Goodlatte
Bishop	Danner	Goodling
Blagojevich	Davis (FL)	Gordon
Bliley	Davis (VA)	Goss
Blumenauer	Deal	Graham
Blunt	DeGette	Granger
Boehlert	Delahunt	Green
Boehner	DeLauro	Greenwood
Bonilla	DeLay	Gutknecht
Bonior	Deutsch	Hall (OH)
Boswell	Dicks	Hall (TX)
Boucher	Dingell	Hamilton
Boyd	Dixon	Hansen
Brady	Doggett	Harman
Brown (FL)	Dooley	Hastings (WA)
Brown (OH)	Doyle	Hayworth
Bryant	Dreier	Hefner
Bunning	Duncan	Herger
Burr	Edwards	Hill
Burton	Ehlers	Hinojosa
Buyer	Ehrlich	Hobson
Callahan	Emerson	Hoekstra
Calvert	Engel	Holden
Camp	Eshoo	Hooley
Campbell	Etheridge	Horn
Canady	Evans	Hostettler

Houghton	Metcalf	Schaefer, Dan
Hoyer	Mica	Schumer
Hulshof	Millender-	Scott
Hutchinson	McDonald	Sensenbrenner
Hyde	Miller (CA)	Serrano
Istook	Miller (FL)	Shadegg
Jackson (IL)	Minge	Shaw
Jackson-Lee	Mink	Shays
(TX)	Mollohan	Sherman
Jenkins	Moran (VA)	Shimkus
John	Morella	Shuster
Johnson (CT)	Murtha	Sisisky
Johnson (WI)	Myrick	Skaggs
Johnson, Sam	Nadler	Skeen
Jones	Neal	Skelton
Kanjorski	Nethercutt	Slaughter
Kaptur	Neumann	Smith (MI)
Kasich	Ney	Smith (NJ)
Kelly	Northup	Smith (OR)
Kennedy (RI)	Norwood	Smith (TX)
Kennelly	Nussle	Smith, Adam
Kildee	Obey	Smith, Linda
Kilpatrick	Olver	Snowbarger
Kim	Ortiz	Snyder
Kind (WI)	Owens	Solomon
King (NY)	Oxley	Souder
Kingston	Packard	Spence
Klecza	Pallone	Spratt
Klink	Pappas	Stabenow
Klug	Pascrell	Stark
Knollenberg	Pastor	Stearns
Kolbe	Paul	Stokes
LaFalce	Paxon	Strickland
LaHood	Payne	Stump
Lampson	Pease	Sununu
Lantos	Pelosi	Talent
Largent	Peterson (MN)	Tanner
Latham	Peterson (PA)	Tauscher
LaTourette	Petri	Tauzin
Lazio	Pitts	Taylor (NC)
Leach	Pombo	Thomas
Levin	Pomeroy	Thornberry
Lewis (CA)	Porter	Thune
Lewis (KY)	Portman	Thurman
Linder	Price (NC)	Tiahrt
Livingston	Pryce (OH)	Tierney
Lofgren	Quinn	Torres
Lowe	Radanovich	Towns
Lucas	Rahall	Trafigant
Luther	Rangel	Upton
Maloney (CT)	Redmond	Velazquez
Maloney (NY)	Regula	Vento
Manton	Reyes	Walsh
Manzullo	Riggs	Wamp
Markey	Riley	Watkins
Mascara	Rivers	Watt (NC)
Matsui	Rodriguez	Waxman
McCarthy (MO)	Roemer	Weldon (FL)
McCarthy (NY)	Rogers	Weldon (PA)
McCollum	Rohrabacher	Wexler
McCrery	Ros-Lehtinen	Weygand
McGovern	Rothman	White
McHale	Roukema	Whitfield
McHugh	Roybal-Allard	Wicker
McIntosh	Royce	Wise
McIntyre	Ryun	Wolf
McKeon	Sanchez	Woolsey
McKinney	Sanders	Wynn
Meehan	Sandlin	Young (AK)
Meek (FL)	Sawyer	Young (FL)
Meeks (NY)	Saxton	
Menendez	Scarborough	

NAYS—38

Becerra	Hefley
Brown (CA)	Hilleary
Clay	Hilliard
Clyburn	Hinchey
DeFazio	Jefferson
Dickey	Johnson, E. B.
English	Kucinich
Ensign	Lewis (GA)
Fazio	LoBiondo
Filner	McDermott
Fox	Moran (KS)
Gillmor	Oberstar
Hastings (FL)	Pickett

NOT VOTING—33

Andrews	Fawell
Bilbray	Gonzalez
Borski	Gutierrez
Cannon	Hastert
Costello	Hunter
Crane	Inglis
Davis (IL)	Kennedy (MA)
Diaz-Balart	Lipinski
Doolittle	Martinez
Dunn	McDade

Schaefer, Dan
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souder
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Tauzin
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Trafigant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Walsh
Wamp
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

□ 1750

So the Journal was approved.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 53, I was out of town attending a wake. Had I been present, I would have voted "yes".

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARMEY) laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, March 17, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
The Speaker, House of Representatives, Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: I have the honor to transmit herewith a copy of the original Certificate of Election received from the Honorable Bill Jones, Secretary of State, State of California, indicating that, according to the semi-official canvass of votes cast in the Special Election held March 10, 1998, the Honorable Lois Capps was elected Representative in Congress for the Twenty-second Congressional District, State of California.

With warm regards,

ROBIN H. CARLE,
Clerk.

STATE OF CALIFORNIA—SECRETARY OF STATE CERTIFICATE OF ELECTION

I, Bill Jones, the Secretary of State of the State of California, hereby certify:

That according to the semi-official canvass of votes cast in the Special Election held on the 10th day of March, 1998 in the 22nd Congressional District,

Lois Capps was elected to the office of United States Representative—District 22, for the term prescribed by law.

In witness whereof, I hereunto set my hand and affix the Great Seal of the State of California at Sacramento, this 11th day of March 1998.

BILL JONES,
Secretary of State.

SWEARING IN OF THE HONORABLE LOIS CAPPS, OF CALIFORNIA, AS A MEMBER OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the Members of the California delegation escort the gentlewoman from California, the Member-elect, to the rostrum to receive the oath of office.

Mrs. Capps appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office, as follows:

Do you solemnly swear that you will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that you will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that you take this obligation freely and without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion, and that you will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which you are about to enter. So help you God?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Congratulations, you are now a Member of the Congress of the United States.

REPRESENTATIVE CAPPS BRINGS WEALTH OF EXPERIENCE TO CONGRESS

(Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Speaker, LOIS CAPPS' journey to Washington, D.C., began in tragedy with the sudden death of her husband and our colleague, Walter Capps. Today, however, the journey has ended in joy and victory, not only for LOIS and her family, but for her constituents.

LOIS brings to Congress a wealth of experience as a health professional, community activist, and educator. LOIS was a nurse for the Santa Barbara School District for 20 years. In this capacity, she served as an elementary district nurse for the entire public school system. She was a coordinator of the teen parent program and was a health consultant for all child development programs. Since 1983, she has periodically taught in the Early Childhood Education Department at Santa Barbara College.

Thousands of Santa Barbara's children and families have benefited from LOIS's personal care and leadership. Under her direction, hundreds of young parents have received the encouragement and the support to stay in school as well as the child development education to ensure that their children grow up healthy and in loving environments.

LOIS also has vast working experience in the community, having devoted herself to many community organizations, including the American Red Cross, the American Heart Association, and the Family Service Agency.

During Walter's all too brief tenure, LOIS was an active partner, traveling with Walter around the central coast, to see firsthand the needs of the people he represented, and also, she traveled to Washington, D.C. where he fought for them and where she was one of the most visible of congressional spouses, frequently sitting in the gallery during votes and debates.

□ 1800

LOIS is committed to continuing the CAPPS legacy of reconnecting people to their representatives, to helping families improve their everyday lives through better schools, quality health care, and a cleaner, healthier environment. LOIS is also committed to following the CAPPS tradition of working with the delegation in its effort to find bipartisan solution to California problems.

We welcome LOIS to Congress and to our delegation. We know that she will be an effective advocate for her constituents, and we look forward to working with her to ensure that the

priorities of her district and of all Californians are the priorities of this Congress.

LOIS, Walter would be very proud of your commitment and your dedication to the people of the 22nd Congressional District.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. GEPHARDT), the Democratic leader.

Mr. GEPHARDT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, this is indeed a joyous day of celebration as we swear in a new Member of the Congress.

I would simply say this one thing. There are a lot of reasons attributed to political victories in congressional seats, but in my view this victory is due to the character, the integrity, and the wonderful citizenship of a woman named LOIS CAPPS. We are very proud of LOIS CAPPS.

A COMMITMENT TO MAKE GOOD ON THE TRUST OF THE CITIZENS OF THE 22ND DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

(Mrs. CAPPS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. CAPPS. Mr. Speaker, I am so thrilled to be here. I want to acknowledge my family: our daughter, Laura; my sister, Frieda; Walter's brother, Roger, and his wife; my cousin, Chuck; and so many friends and staff members. You know I could not be here without you.

My heart is so full, as you know, as I stand where Walter stood so many times and looked out at all of you who were his treasured friends, and friendship that extended to me. How can I thank you for your eloquence in the memorials that you gave to him, to me and to him, following his death? Now you welcome me here today. I will always be grateful for this moment.

As I think of the citizens of the 22nd District of the central coast of California, who elected Walter just a year and a half ago, they trusted him. Now they have extended that trust to me, so I have come here to make good on that trust, to build on that trust.

I bring with me so many stories from the over 30 years that I have lived in our District. Just last Saturday I was at a community college, Cuesta Community College near the city of San Luis Obispo, and I heard the remarkable stories of five distinguished women being honored for their community service. I thought to myself, that is my inspiration. These are my role models to take with me to this place. I have brought them with me in my mind's eye today, and so many other stories like that.

During the last 4 months, Mr. Speaker, I have received the mandate, several mandates, from the citizens of the 22nd District of California. Despite the din of outside special interests, in lan-

guage plain and simple, they have told me in no uncertain terms that they want us to work hard to make our schools better. As one who has spent a lifetime in the classrooms of my district, I know the importance of local control; but, believe me, this task is so great that we must all work toward this end. The goals are too important.

Business leaders have come to me, saying, I want to partner with education because the net result will be a work force, jobs that are meaningful, people's lives that are enhanced; the quality of life that we want in the central coast of California, yes, but throughout the country. This is what we need also to keep our economy moving.

As a nurse, Members do not have to tell me about the mandate to reform health care, to curb the excesses, to bring back patient-centered care, and to allow more access to it. For me, clean air and clean water are health issues. Where I come from, preserving a pristine coastline is a sacred trust.

Of course, the overarching mandate is, in all of our deliberations, LOIS, be sure to do this in a fiscally responsible way. My answer is, I had a good example in the 105th Congress in the Balanced Budget Act of 1997. I say to the small business owners in my district, yes, now we are going to go to work to simplify that Tax Code, to reform the IRS. They have told me in loud and simple terms that we must do this.

So you can see, Mr. Speaker, that I have come here ready to go to work. This is not a partisan task, because the bottom line is the common good. That which unites us, not that which divides us, is of enduring value. And we all know in our soul, and I am so privileged to be a part, that in this place, in this House what we are about is nothing less than preserving and strengthening democracy. I thank you for the opportunity to serve.

URGING RESOLUTION ON HUMAN RIGHTS SITUATION IN PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF CHINA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ARMEY). The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, H. Res. 364, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. SMITH) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, H. Res. 364, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This will be a 15-minute vote, to be followed by a five-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 397, nays 0, not voting 34, as follows:

[Roll No. 54]

YEAS—397

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier

Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger
Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Herger
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hutchinson
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)
Linder
Livingston
LoBiondo
Lofgren
Lowey
Lucas
Luther
Maloney (CT)
Maloney (NY)
Manton
Manzullo
Markey
Mascara
Matsui
McCarthy (MO)
McCarthy (NY)
McCollum
McCrery
McDermott
McGovern
McHale
McHugh
McIntosh
McIntyre
McKeon
McKinney
Meehan
Meek (FL)
Meeks (NY)
Menendez
Metcalfe
Mica
Millender-
McDonald
Miller (CA)
Miller (FL)
Minge
Mink
Mollohan
Moran (KS)
Moran (VA)
Morella
Murtha
Myrick
Nadler
Neal
Nethercutt
Neumann
Ney
Northup
Norwood
Nussle
Oberstar
Obey
Olver
Ortiz
Owens
Oxley
Packard
Pallone
Pappas
Pascrell
Pastor
Paul
Paxon
Payne
Pease
Pelosi
Peterson (MN)
Peterson (PA)
Petri
Pickering
Pickett
Pitts
Pombo
Pomeroy
Porter

Portman
Price (NC)
Pryce (OH)
Quinn
Radanovich
Rahall
Ramstad
Rangel
Redmond
Regula
Reyes
Riggs
Riley
Rivers
Rodriguez
Roemer
Rogan
Rogers
Rohrabacher
Ros-Lehtinen
Rothman
Roukema
Roybal-Allard
Royce
Ryun
Sabo
Sanchez
Sanders
Sandlin
Sawyer
Saxton
Scarborough
Schaefer, Dan
Schaffer, Bob
Schumer
Scott
Sensenbrenner

Serrano
Sessions
Shadegg
Shaw
Shays
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Sisisky
Skaggs
Skeen
Skelton
Slaughter
Smith (MI)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (OR)
Smith (TX)
Smith, Adam
Smith, Linda
Snowbarger
Snyder
Solomon
Souders
Spence
Spratt
Stabenow
Stark
Stearns
Stenholm
Stokes
Strickland
Stump
Sununu
Talent
Tanner
Tauscher
Taubin

Taylor (MS)
Taylor (NC)
Thomas
Thompson
Thornberry
Thune
Thurman
Tiahrt
Tierney
Torres
Towns
Traficant
Upton
Velazquez
Vento
Visclosky
Walsh
Wamp
Waters
Watkins
Watt (NC)
Watts (OK)
Waxman
Weldon (FL)
Weldon (PA)
Weller
Wexler
Weygand
White
Whitfield
Wicker
Wise
Wolf
Woolsey
Wynn
Young (AK)
Young (FL)

NOT VOTING—34

Andrews
Bilbray
Borski
Cannon
Collins
Costello
Crane
Davis (IL)
Diaz-Balart
Dunn
English
Fawell

Gonzalez
Gutierrez
Harman
Hastert
Hunter
Inglis
Kennedy (MA)
Lipinski
Martinez
McDade
McInnis
McNulty

Moakley
Parker
Poshard
Rush
Salmon
Sanford
Schiff
Stupak
Turner
Yates

□ 1826

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call No. 54, I was out of town attending a wake. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H. Res. 364, urging the President to criticize China's human right, violations at the United Nations, I would have voted "aye".

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Pursuant to the provisions of clause 5 of rule I, the Chair announces that she will reduce to a minimum of 5 minutes the period of time within which a vote by electronic device may be taken on the additional motion to suspend the rules on which the Chair has postponed further proceedings.

CALLING FOR FREE AND IMPARTIAL ELECTIONS IN CAMBODIA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The pending business is the question of suspending the rules and agreeing to the resolution, House Resolution 361, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by gentleman from Nebraska (Mr. BEREUTER) that the House suspend the rules and agree to the resolution, House Resolution 361, as amended, on which the yeas and nays are ordered.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 393, nays 1, not voting 37, as follows:

[Roll No. 55]

YEAS—393

Abercrombie
Ackerman
Aderholt
Allen
Archer
Armey
Bachus
Baesler
Baker
Baldacci
Ballenger
Barcia
Barr
Barrett (NE)
Barrett (WI)
Bartlett
Barton
Bass
Bateman
Becerra
Bentsen
Bereuter
Berman
Berry
Billirakis
Bishop
Blagojevich
Bliley
Blumenauer
Blunt
Boehlert
Boehner
Bonilla
Bonior
Boswell
Boucher
Boyd
Brady
Brown (CA)
Brown (FL)
Brown (OH)
Bryant
Bunning
Burr
Burton
Buyer
Callahan
Calvert
Camp
Campbell
Canady
Capps
Cardin
Carson
Castle
Chabot
Chambliss
Chenoweth
Christensen
Clay
Clayton
Clement
Clyburn
Coble
Coburn
Combust
Condit
Conyers
Cook
Cooksey
Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger

Cox
Coyne
Cramer
Crapo
Cubin
Cummings
Cunningham
Danner
Davis (FL)
Davis (VA)
Deal
DeFazio
DeGette
Delahunt
DeLauro
DeLay
Deutsch
Dickey
Dicks
Dingell
Dixon
Doggett
Dooley
Dooley
Doolittle
Doyle
Dreier
Duncan
Edwards
Ehlers
Ehrlich
Emerson
Engel
English
Ensign
Eshoo
Etheridge
Evans
Everett
Ewing
Farr
Fattah
Fazio
Filner
Foley
Forbes
Ford
Fossella
Fowler
Fox
Frank (MA)
Franks (NJ)
Frelinghuysen
Frost
Furse
Gallegly
Ganske
Gejdenson
Gekas
Gephardt
Gibbons
Gilchrist
Gillmor
Gilman
Goode
Goode
Goodlatte
Goodling
Gordon
Goss
Graham
Granger

Green
Greenwood
Gutknecht
Hall (OH)
Hall (TX)
Hamilton
Hansen
Harman
Hastings (FL)
Hastings (WA)
Hayworth
Hefley
Hefner
Hill
Hilleary
Hilliard
Hinchey
Hinojosa
Hobson
Hoekstra
Holden
Hooley
Horn
Hostettler
Houghton
Hoyer
Hulshof
Hyde
Istook
Jackson (IL)
Jackson-Lee
(TX)
Jefferson
Jenkins
John
Johnson (CT)
Johnson (WI)
Johnson, E. B.
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Kanjorski
Kaptur
Kasich
Kelly
Kennedy (RI)
Kennelly
Kildee
Kilpatrick
Kim
Kind (WI)
King (NY)
Kingston
Kleczka
Klink
Klug
Knollenberg
Kolbe
Kucinich
LaHood
Lampson
Lantos
Latham
LaTourette
Lazio
Leach
Levin
Lewis (CA)
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (KY)

Linder	Paxon	Smith (MI)
Livingston	Payne	Smith (NJ)
LoBiondo	Pease	Smith (OR)
Lofgren	Pelosi	Smith (TX)
Lowey	Peterson (MN)	Smith, Adam
Lucas	Peterson (PA)	Smith, Linda
Luther	Petri	Snowbarger
Maloney (CT)	Pickering	Snyder
Maloney (NY)	Pickett	Solomon
Manton	Pitts	Souder
Manzullo	Pombo	Spence
Markey	Pomeroy	Spratt
Mascara	Portman	Stabenow
Matsui	Price (NC)	Stark
McCarthy (MO)	Pryce (OH)	Stearns
McCarthy (NY)	Quinn	Stenholm
McCollum	Radanovich	Stokes
McCrery	Rahall	Strickland
McDermott	Ramstad	Stump
McGovern	Rangel	Sununu
McHale	Redmond	Talent
McHugh	Regula	Tanner
McIntosh	Reyes	Tauscher
McIntyre	Riggs	Tauzin
McKeon	Riley	Taylor (MS)
McKinney	Rivers	Taylor (NC)
Meehan	Rodriguez	Thomas
Meek (FL)	Roemer	Thompson
Meeks (NY)	Rogan	Thornberry
Menendez	Rogers	Thune
Metcalf	Rohrabacher	Thurman
Mica	Ros-Lehtinen	Tiahrt
Millender-	Rothman	Tierney
McDonald	Roukema	Torres
Miller (CA)	Roybal-Allard	Towns
Miller (FL)	Royce	Trafficant
Minge	Ryun	Upton
Mink	Sabo	Velazquez
Mollohan	Sanchez	Vento
Moran (KS)	Sanders	Visclosky
Moran (VA)	Sandlin	Walsh
Morella	Sawyer	Wamp
Murtha	Saxton	Waters
Myrick	Scarborough	Watkins
Nadler	Schaefer, Dan	Watt (NC)
Neal	Schaffer, Bob	Watts (OK)
Nethercutt	Schumer	Waxman
Neumann	Scott	Weldon (FL)
Ney	Sensenbrenner	Weldon (PA)
Northup	Serrano	Weller
Norwood	Sessions	Wexler
Nussle	Shadegg	Weygand
Oberstar	Shaw	White
Olver	Shays	Whitfield
Ortiz	Sherman	Wicker
Owens	Shimkus	Wise
Oxley	Shuster	Wolf
Packard	Sisisky	Woolsey
Pallone	Skaggs	Wynn
Pappas	Skeen	Young (AK)
Pascrell	Skelton	Young (FL)
Pastor	Slaughter	

NAYS—1

Paul

NOT VOTING—37

Andrews	Hastert	Obey
Bilbray	Herger	Parker
Borski	Hunter	Porter
Cannon	Hutchinson	Poshard
Collins	Inglis	Rush
Costello	Kennedy (MA)	Salmon
Crane	Largent	Sanford
Davis (IL)	Lipinski	Schiff
Diaz-Balart	Martinez	Stupak
Dunn	McDade	Turner
Fawell	McInnis	Yates
Gonzalez	McNulty	
Gutierrez	Moakley	

□ 1835

So (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the resolution, as amended, was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, on roll call no. 55, I was out of town attending a wake. Had I been present, I would have voted yes.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, had I been present for the vote on H. Res. 361, a resolution calling for free and impartial elections in Cambodia, I would have voted "aye".

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 1415

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my name be withdrawn as a cosponsor of H.R. 1415.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mrs. EMERSON). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT PROCESS FOR H.R. 3246, THE FAIRNESS FOR SMALL BUSINESS AND EMPLOYEES ACT OF 1998

(Mr. DREIER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DREIER. Madam Speaker, the Committee on Rules is planning to meet next week to grant a rule to limit the amendments which may be offered to H.R. 3246, the Fairness for Small Business and Employees Act of 1998.

Any Member who wishes to offer an amendment should submit 55 copies and a brief explanation of the amendment by 2 p.m. on Monday, March 23rd, to the Committee on Rules, room H-312 of the Capitol.

H.R. 3246 was ordered reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce on March 11th, and the report is expected to be filed Wednesday. Amendments should be drafted to the text of the bill as reported by the Committee on Education and the Workforce. Until the report is available in the document room, copies of the text of the bill as reported can be obtained from the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

Members should use the Office of Legislative Counsel to ensure their amendments are properly drafted and should check with the Office of Parliamentarian to be certain their amendments comply with the rules of the House.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CHAIRMAN OF THE COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House a communication from the Chairman of the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct:

COMMITTEE ON STANDARDS OF OFFICIAL CONDUCT,
Washington, DC, March 16, 1998.

Hon. NEWT GINGRICH,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: This is to formally notify you, pursuant to Rule L (50) of the Rules of the House of Representatives, that the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct ("Committee") has been served with a grand

jury subpoena (for documents) issued by the U.S. District Court for the District of Massachusetts and directed to the Committee's "Keeper of Records."

After the consultation with the Office of General Counsel, the Committee has determined that compliance with the subpoena is not consistent with the precedents and privileges of the House and, therefore, that the subpoena should be resisted.

Sincerely,

JAMES V. HANSEN,
Chairman.

SPECIAL ORDERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, and under a previous order of the House, the following Members will be recognized for 5 minutes each.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mrs. TAUSCHER) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. TAUSCHER addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

TRIBUTE TO COLONEL PAUL G. UNDERWOOD

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in honor of a great American, an American who has returned home to be buried in his beloved country. Colonel Paul G. Underwood was not only a great American, he was also a beloved son, a brother, a husband, father and friend, who served our Nation as a brave pilot and who ultimately made the supreme sacrifice in the name of freedom.

Colonel Underwood began his military career by enlisting in the United States Marine Corps Reserve and then later transferring to the Air Corps. After attending school at Northrop Aeronautical School, he joined the Air Force where his flying duties led him to the F-105 Thunderchief.

Through the course of his distinguished military career, Colonel Underwood earned a number of awards; including the Distinguished Flying Cross, an Air Medal with four Oak Leaf

Clusters, a World War II Victory Medal, a Vietnam Service Medal and a Purple Heart.

Prior to 1966, his war service to our Nation included World War II and Korea, with 201 combat missions. In January of that year, Colonel Underwood was deployed to Vietnam from Seymour Johnson Air Force Base in eastern North Carolina. While there, he bravely and nobly performed 22 combat missions.

Unfortunately, on March 18th, 1966, Colonel Underwood's F-105 Thunderchief was shot down. He was then listed MIA for 12 long years and was ultimately declared dead. The Underwood family was forced to suffer not only with a tremendous and almost unbearable loss, but also with a great deal of uncertainty. It was not until recently that Colonel Underwood's remains were recovered in North Vietnam.

Yesterday, 32 years to the date of his death, I had the honor and privilege to have the humbling experience of attending Colonel Underwood's funeral at Arlington National Cemetery. Mr. Speaker, I cannot express in words what this experience meant to me. So many, far too many, young Americans have been seriously wounded and have even given their lives for this country. So many families have suffered.

I would like to take this opportunity tonight to recognize and honor Colonel Underwood and his family and all those who have sacrificed and have either lost their own lives or lost a loved one in service to this Nation.

□ 1845

Ms. Gloria Underwood is a role model to us all. She is a remarkably strong person who, despite suffering through an almost unbelievable ordeal for 32 years now, managed to rise above many difficulties and to raise a fine family. I thank her from the bottom of my heart for including me in yesterday's very special service.

I would like also to remind the Underwoods and all families who have faced similar tragedies that, as sorrowful and difficult as the loss of a loved one in service must be, it is not in vain; it is for America and for all her future generations. Brave soldiers like Colonel Underwood are the Nation's strength.

The words are best expressed in the following lines written by Ralph Waldo Emerson in his poem, "A Nation's Strength," and I quote,

Not gold but only men can make a people great and strong; men who for truth and honor's sake stand fast and suffer long. Brave men who work while others sleep, who dare while others fly, they build a nation's pillars deep and lift them to the sky.

Mr. Speaker, an American hero has returned home to his family and a grateful nation to take his place among the many war heroes that are buried at Arlington National Cemetery. He rose and fought and died for the many freedoms that we too many times take for granted.

I salute Colonel Paul Underwood, a true American hero, and his family and all those who have fought and died and suffered loss in the name of freedom. The men like Colonel Underwood have truly given this Nation its strength. Let us never forget their sacrifices, Mr. Speaker. And God bless America.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Ms. DELAURO addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extension of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Maryland (Mrs. MORELLA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mrs. MORELLA addressed the House. Her remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. PALLONE addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from California (Mr. RIGGS) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. RIGGS addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. ISTOOK addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Florida (Mr. MICA) is recognized for 5 minutes.

(Mr. MICA addressed the House. His remarks will appear hereafter in the Extensions of Remarks.)

DIALOGUE ON RACE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I called a special order tonight with a bipartisan delegation, Members of Congress that traveled from Washington to Birmingham, Montgomery, and Selma during March 6 through the 8th. Along with Members of the Congress that included AMO HOUGHTON, EARL HILLIARD, SHERROD BROWN, TOM BARRETT, KAREN

THURMAN, FRED UPTON, DIANA DEGETTE, ELIOT ENGEL, SHEILA JACKSON-LEE, we also had the head of the National Democratic Committee, Roy Roman, and Jim Nicholson, the Republican National Committee chair.

This trip was to be part of a dialogue on race, which was sponsored by Faith and Politics Institute under the leadership of Doug Tanner. These Members decided to travel to Birmingham to the site of the 16th Street Baptist Church and visit the church where four little girls were killed by a bomb on September 15, 1963, and from there to visit the Civil Rights Museum and to see some of the historic sites that changed America.

From there we traveled to the City of Montgomery, where we had an opportunity to visit the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church that Martin Luther King, Jr., was called to pastor in 1954 and where he led the successful Montgomery bus boycott.

We had an opportunity while we were in Montgomery to visit former Governor George Wallace and to talk with him, to shake his hand, to tour the capitol in the City of Montgomery, to visit the Civil Rights Memorial there and travel from Montgomery on early Sunday morning to the City of Selma, where we attended service at the Brown Chapel A.M.E. Church. And later we had lunch that was sponsored by the mayor of Selma, Mayor Smitherman.

In 1965, 33 years ago, in the City of Selma only 2.1 percent of blacks of voting age were registered to vote. In one county between Selma and Montgomery, Loundes County, that we traveled through on our way to Selma, in 1965 that county was more than 80 percent African-American. There was not a single registered African-American voter. But today in Selma in Loundes County in the State of Alabama we have witnessed unbelievable changes. It is a different State. It is a different place.

What I would like to do now, Mr. Speaker, is to yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), my colleague and the co-chair of the Faith and Politics Institute and one of the real leaders of this whole Dialogue on Race.

Mr. HOUGHTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I am, obviously, honored and really moved to be here, as I was when we went on that extraordinary weekend. I think we all sort of feel that we walk in the shadow of JOHN LEWIS. We can reconstruct history. We can read about it. But to be part of history with a man like JOHN LEWIS, who was there and who suffered all the humiliations and the physical beatings and the agonies of those times was really something.

I mean, I do not think I will ever get over it. As I mentioned to Mr. LEWIS, it was almost like my trip to the Holy Land. It was a religious experience. This was a group that did not have any legislative program. We did not want

to start any new government project. But we wanted to deal honestly with ourselves. And I think Mr. LEWIS will agree that we did that. I know that he has always tried to deal honestly with us, and I hope we were able to do this with him and some of his associates down there.

It was extraordinary to see the people who were associated there. There was a wonderful lady. I call her lady now. But in those days, 30 years ago, she was a young girl; and when the conditions got very sad, she would break into song and pull everybody's spirits up. She did it with us.

Really, it was a pilgrimage that we went through in going to those three extraordinary cities, going to the Civil Rights Museum, seeing that extraordinary civil rights piece of sculpture which Maya Lyn did, similar to the Vietnam Memorial.

I think the thing that meant almost as much to me was just being with this man here and listening to him. Let me give my colleagues just a couple of statements.

JOHN said in our meeting at the airport when we were about to return, he said,

You know, there are two things that sort of come to mind here. First, every so often there is an issue, it is an important issue, it is usually a social issue. And if you feel strongly about it and there is an element of evil to it, you have got to stand in the way of it, you have got to stand in the way of it. And those of us who look at it and walk around it and walk on about our daily lives, it is really a cop-out.

And that is, of course, what happened. It was extraordinary to see the people who stood in the way of the civil rights issue.

The other thing that I think that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) was talking about, and some of us were saying, how could you have been so patient? People were literally mauling them and beating them up. All the people we had talked to had been through the same experience. How could you show such restraint?

The gentleman from Georgia said, you know, we thought about that. I think it was every Tuesday night, we used to have these sessions of training prior to the march. We were taught to consider the people out there who were full of so much venom and hate not as our enemies, we did not have time to hate people, but as victims of a culture that they did not have any part of; they could not control themselves.

So with that, those two themes, the idea of standing in the way of something, standing up, doing something about it permanently, and that also doing it in this marvelous sense that Dr. Martin Luther King epitomized so well, it did something to us. It was far beyond just the race issue.

I think the interesting thing, if I can talk just a second more autobiographically, that we took these dialogues on race and the discussion which the Faith and Politics Institute put into

effect and took them back into our districts. There were meetings all over the country.

We started talking race, but we ended up talking about ourselves and our children and our families and our communities. But we were being honest about it. It was an extraordinary transformation. I give that credit to this distinguished man standing over here, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). We are the better for it.

In ending, I would just like to say, although most of us were not there with you at that time, I hope we can follow worthily where you have led the way.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) for those words. I think this is only a beginning toward us building that beloved community and moving toward laying down the burden of race. That is why the dialogue must continue.

I yield to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) for yielding. I very much appreciate the opportunity to say a few words tonight. Especially, even more, I appreciated the opportunity to be part of a remarkable weekend in Montgomery and Birmingham and Selma.

I was there with my mother, who grew up in a small town in Georgia, and with my daughter Emily, who is 16. To watch the interaction between the two of them was remarkable in this kind of situation.

Margaret Mead once said many, many years ago that grandparents tend to impart wisdom to their grandchildren; that knowledge in this society is passed from grandparent to grandchildren.

So for my 16-year-old daughter Emily to listen to my mother talk about drinking fountains in the South that said white and said colored, the white drinking fountain was much nicer and newer than the drinking fountain reserved for African-Americans, and to spend these 3 days with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) in Selma and Montgomery and Birmingham, to see what happened to him in these periods in 1965 and really in the many years in the 1960s when he was so much a part of the civil rights movement, so much a leader in the civil rights movement.

But what comes through more than anything that my mother and my daughter and all of us that were part of this pilgrimage to Alabama, what we all saw was the ability, the capacity for forgiveness. People that were literally trying to kill JOHN LEWIS, people that were beating, beating with sticks, or were giving political orders or whatever to hurt people like JOHN LEWIS. And to end this movement, that the gentleman from Georgia and others in the civil rights movement, people like the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), were able to have a capacity to forgive in a situation like that.

It is a remarkable thing that, as the gentleman from Georgia forgave and as

others in the civil rights movement forgave people that wanted to wrong them, it really did begin to change the hearts of those people who would either hit them with sticks or tromp them with horse's hooves or giving political orders to attack or to assault, those people's hearts were changed as the gentleman from Georgia and others forgave.

That is really maybe the most remarkable part about the week and the most remarkable part about the civil rights movement is the mayor of Selma, Alabama, who is a very impressive gentleman, who is now 68 years old, 34 years ago, he was elected mayor. Several weeks later, he met the gentleman from Georgia. He at that time called JOHN LEWIS a rabble-rouser and a troublemaker. Today, this past weekend, at lunch, he called JOHN LEWIS one of the most, if not the most, courageous person he had ever met.

This man had a wonderful capacity to change and open his heart up as people like the gentleman from Georgia had the same capacity to forgive and saw bringing together the races.

The best part about all of that is that we, for the first time in many people's lives that were in this trip, we heard African-Americans talk honestly about what it is like to be black, and then blacks were able to listen to white people talk about what it is like and to really communicate with each other, something that we clearly do not do enough of in this country.

So it was a remarkable time in the 1960s and throughout the civil rights movement and the last 200 years, but a particularly remarkable time as things began to more rapidly change. I think all of us, African-Americans and whites, on this trip were all changed for the better.

□ 1900

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), who was also part of our trip to Selma.

Mr. UPTON. I thank the gentleman for yielding. I just want to say I was very pleased to have joined this bipartisan effort, certainly not only as a Republican but more as an American, to actually have walked in the footsteps and to see some of those struggles. For me growing up in Michigan, never having really been to the South, never certainly been to Alabama until this weekend, two weeks ago, it was an amazing, extraordinary adventure for me. As I think about my district, diverse in so many needs and issues, whether rural and urban, industrialwise, in agriculture and diverse too in ethnicity, this was a very important trip for me, not only to understand some of the divisions that existed not only in the North but to see the real footsteps that the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) led in the South.

As the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) indicated before,

though there were many of us that were sad that we were not with him back in the 1960s, for me I had an excuse as I might have been 7 years old, we want to finish this trail with the gentleman from Georgia. As we traveled this way and spent substantial time not only on the bus talking about the trials and tribulations that he went through, but I know that for sure the dozen of us that were there are indeed much closer as Americans and as Members of this House in respecting those convictions that all of us have for each other and our views and our districts that each of us represents. As the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON) indicated, it was a religious experience. One cannot describe it, certainly in the hour that we have here tonight, but in discussions certainly the Faith in Politics Institute began several months ago, as we see these unfold in the future. We love him. We love all that he did for America and for this House in terms of his leadership then and now. We certainly look forward to walking this path with him, with all Americans, as we try and end hatred and racism and things that sadly exist in far too many homes across this country.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL).

Mr. ENGEL. I thank the gentleman from Michigan for yielding to me. I was very privileged to also be part of the delegation which went with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) to Alabama, to Birmingham, Montgomery and to Selma. It was as my colleagues have mentioned, a very, very moving experience. It was especially moving for me, Mr. Speaker.

I represent a district, a very diverse district in New York which is about a third African-American, a third Hispanic and a third white. We know better than most people that people have to live together and people have to work together. I think there is nothing that better personifies that than the civil rights struggle.

To my right is a picture of us in Montgomery, Alabama joining hands, locking hands and singing We Shall Overcome at the Southern Poverty Law Center. It was one of the very moving moments of the trip. Believe me, there were many, many moving moments at the trip, the feeling of working together and being together and joining in the struggle for civil rights together. Although people like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), whom I refer to as a real American hero and the gentleman is a real American hero and it is an honor to be his colleague and to be in the House with him, the fact of the matter is we have come a long way in the United States in terms of race relations. But obviously we still have a long, long way to go. We can learn from the past. The past can help us learn and prepare for the future. To be down in Alabama at the 16th Street Baptist Church with those 4 little girls who were killed, one

of those girls was my age when she was blown to bits. I remember it very, very vividly, hearing about it on the news. To be in the Dexter Avenue Baptist Church in Montgomery, where Dr. Martin Luther King was the minister, was really a feeling to behold. To go to Selma and to actually go over that bridge and to understand where history was made, on the highway past the spot where Viola Liuzzo was gunned down and to see all these other places that we read about, that we heard about, I was a little too young at the time to be able to make the trip down but I was old enough to understand what was happening.

I remember the first time I ever went to the South in 1967 with two friends and saw the signs, the segregated signs, and could not believe that this was a part of America. I think what one of our colleagues said, which is the genius of JOHN LEWIS, is how can someone go through what he went through and emerge not only as a person who is not bitter but as a person who understands the necessity of trying to bring people together and who continues to do that more than any other person that I know. It was just an honor for me and also a tribute, I think, to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and also just to be a part of it, to understand what this means to the United States, the greatest country in the world, we are honored and we are privileged to serve in the United States Congress representing the greatest country in the world, but we learn again from our past.

We know in the United States so many diverse people, coming together, living together, we are all Americans, we have different backgrounds. That is the genius and the greatness of our country, trying to bring people together, trying to accentuate the similarities in people rather than trying to accentuate our differences. That is what I try to do in my district in New York. I know the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) has been doing it for his entire life. I just want to say to my colleague from Georgia that it was an honor and a privilege being with him that weekend in Alabama. It is an honor and privilege serving with him. We need to all move forward and to continue to bring people in this great country together. The people who did this 33 years ago and 35 years ago and before that in the civil rights movement are truly the people who made this country better for all of us.

Again, we still have a long way to go and we have to keep being resolute in saying that in this country we need to continue to have dialogue. I commend President Clinton for his dialogue on race. We need to learn from the past and we need to move forward for the future. I was honored and privileged to be part of the delegation. I look forward to a continuing dialogue in making race relations in our great country better and better and better.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT).

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I think all of us felt the same way, all of us who were on this weekend. It was probably one of the most, if not the most, amazing weekend I have spent in my 5½ years in Congress. We all fashion ourselves as busy people, sometimes we are too busy to take the time to talk to each other, to get to know each other but, more importantly, we do not take the time to reflect and find out from our backgrounds what we can do to bring us together.

For me this was just a weekend I will never forget my entire life. Going down to Alabama for the first time in my life, traveling with the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) through his district, he was a wonderful host, and with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS). Someone remarked the weekend was a lot like taking a history course taught by the professor who created the history, because JOHN LEWIS was such an integral part of this. For me to go home and tell my family and my friends what an amazing weekend it was really is going to have an impact.

For me there were several things that really jumped out. Probably the part that I will remember the most is when we went to visit former Governor George Wallace. The number of us, I think, northern Democrats when we went into the room, he is not a person that in my neck of the woods was a person that I grew up respecting in all honesty. But when I saw JOHN LEWIS and EARL HILLIARD go up and greet him, I thought, well, if they have room in their heart for forgiveness, I should have room in my heart for forgiveness as well. But it was not something that came easy. For me to see the remarkable degree of calmness that was displayed and has been displayed by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), again I went home and remarked to my wife, "This is an amazing guy. He shows no anger, he shows no bitterness." I do not know that there are many people in this world who could have done what he did and not showed any anger or bitterness. Someone else said to me, he was 21 years old or 22 years old when he did this. Would you have had the courage to do that when you were 21 or 22? I said, "I don't know that I would have the courage to do it now." Because he was putting his life on the line and all the people who were involved in this struggle were putting their lives on the line. As we have sat around, and we have for several evenings talking about our backgrounds, I and the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON) and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) and some of the younger Members here, I felt a little, I did not want to say unworthy but I did not have the same shared experience because people who were 10 or 15 years older than I had gone through lot of

this. So as we went around the room and people said what they were doing at this period, I was in the third, fourth or fifth grade, I was probably playing softball or something like that. I did not have a shared experience. I did not know whether I had anything I could add to this conversation. But as I left that weekend, what I probably came away with more than anything is that this is not a struggle that is over, this is not even a struggle that has been resolved in a way that people can say, "Well, let's move on to something else." It is a struggle for human beings to get to know each other and to try to shed our differences and try to find out what we have in common. For that I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), I thank the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL), I thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD), I thank the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN), the gentleman from New York (Mr. HOUGHTON), the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. UPTON), the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. THURMAN), the other people who were on this trip because I think it helps us all grow. I think what this institution needs is to talk to each other and try to come together.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me just add before the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) speaks, just to thank him again for being such a great host. We were in his district the entire time in Birmingham, in Montgomery, in Selma. We want to thank the gentleman.

Mr. HILLIARD. I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) very much. Let me thank all my colleagues. It was indeed a privilege and a pleasure for us to entertain you and to walk back into history with you. The civil rights movement presented a difficult thing for our Nation at a very difficult time, but it was Americans like the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) that made the difference. To walk back into history with him and with a few of the other people who participated in the civil rights movement at that time and to walk back with colleagues of mine who had not participated but who had a chance to see firsthand some of the things that took place, the films we saw, the movies, the videos, being able to once again cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge, being able to walk through the Civil Rights Museum in Birmingham, Alabama, and to visit the Civil Rights Institute was indeed something that does not happen often. We were pleased to have all of you walk what we call the Civil Rights Trail in Alabama. We did not get a chance to walk all of it. We did not get a chance to even walk the majority of it. But the most important thing, we were there and because you came, the press came, and we had a chance for America to look back at its past, to recall some of the terrible events that took place, and hopefully to enlighten some of the young people who were not born 33 years ago, who did not know of our Na-

tion's past, so that they would have a chance to learn about it and hopefully to have such an appreciation until they would dedicate themselves to freedom for everyone, so that it would never happen again in America.

The treatment that you receive and others in trying to cross the Selma-Montgomery Trail, in trying to cross the Edmund Pettus Bridge and in walking from Selma to Montgomery was inhumane and it was not the type of treatment that Americans are used to. It is a thing of the past. It is something that we should never forget, but it was the past. When we reflect back, when we look at what took place, it gives us an opportunity to see what happened and to keep it before the public so that never again will it be a part of our history, not to any minority, not for any reason, so that we could really enhance the democracy that we have.

□ 1915

So having the opportunity to have so many congressional types in our Alabama on such an occasion was indeed a good experience, not only because of the presence of my colleagues, but because of the fact that we had a chance to visit George Wallace; we had a chance to dialogue with the head of the two major parties in this country, and they had a chance to participate.

So it was really enjoyable and educational, having all of my colleagues there. We appreciate you. We invite you back. We want you to come, and we want to go to the next level the next time. We will be talking about that in the coming months. Hopefully, we will do it from this podium.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, one of the lighter moments of the trip, perhaps, was we met the fellow, I believe Deacon McNair, in the church, and we will put his picture up in a moment. He is, I believe, 89 years old, he told us, sort of soft-spoken, a slightly built man, who told us as he ran through sort of the history on the wall, this was the church in Montgomery where, the Dexter Avenue Church where Dr. King was called. And he told us the story that in 1954, I believe, when Dr. King would have been 24 years old, 1953, I guess he would have been 24 years old, and he had already accepted his first church, his first calling at a church in Chattanooga, and this gentleman in Montgomery decided that he was going to do something about that. So he drove his car over to Atlanta and met with Dr. King's parents and Dr. King and convinced him not to go to Chattanooga, but instead to go to Montgomery. So he changed history when he did that.

I see the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) laughing, because I imagine he was an old friend of his. But it was a wonderful story, and Dr. King only had one church in his life that he was the pastor of, the church in Birmingham on Dexter Avenue, and this man was the gentleman responsible for getting him there.

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, by the way, I believe, had been a member of that church for some 93 years; he was that old. He takes credit for bringing Dr. King there, and indeed, he deserves the credit. But he also deserves the credit for changing the history of this country, and for that I am thankful.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I think this particular deacon, as head of the deacon board, he made a great contribution, and I think when historians pick up their pens and write about this period, they would have to say that this one man had the insight, the vision, to go to Atlanta, as the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN) suggested, and convince Dr. King not to go to Chattanooga, Tennessee, but to come to Montgomery, Alabama. That is something I think from time to time in human history, call it what you may, it may be the spirit of history, that tends to track one down, and so Martin Luther King, Jr., was there at the right time in the right city to change not just Alabama, the South, but the Nation.

I think because of what happened in Montgomery, in Birmingham, in Selma, we have witnessed what I like to call a nonviolent revolution. We live in a different country, a better country, and we are a better people. I think we saw that. We saw the changes in Selma. We saw it in Birmingham when a middle-aged man walked up to me and said, I want to apologize for what happened here a few years ago. I am sorry. And I think that is very much in keeping with the philosophy and the discipline of nonviolence which was very much a part of the movement.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I want to yield to the gentleman from Milwaukee, Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT) in a moment because he tells the story so well, but we tend to lose sight, I think, people that are Northerners and especially people that are white, people who have not paid as much attention to the civil right movement, and we lose sight of the fact that this was made up of a lot of very young people that are leaders in this room. JOHN LEWIS, when he led the freedom riots, was 21 years old, when he knew he was going to get beat up on the bus when the bus arrived in Montgomery. Martin Luther King was 24 years old when he took his church, and during the bus boycott he was 26 years old, and what all of that meant and how he won the Nobel Prize at 35 and was killed at 39. He was such a young man during all of this. My friend from Milwaukee has a story about a man that was very, very young and showed more courage than perhaps most of us have in our lives combined.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, it starts as we were riding the bus from Montgomery to Selma, during the hour-and-a-half bus ride, or whatever the time period was, we were shown one of the PBS series, Eye on the Prize, and in the segment that

dealt with Selma, it was a segment where there were probably 15 or 16 young people who had sort of broken loose from a curfew and were walking to the courthouse, and they were walking to the courthouse to make their case for being able to register to vote, and they were stopped by, I think it was the sheriff, the sheriff from the area.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, one of the deputy sheriffs.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, one of his deputies, and it was almost a humbling experience watching this little exchange between this young man, who was a very small man, and he looked very, very young. And as I was watching it, I was, first of all, struck by how he could remain so calm as this deputy sheriff threw racial slur, racial slur at him over and over again, and he just did not lose his cool. He stood there and took it and asked the questions about do you believe in justice, do you believe in prayer, can we pray together, and over and over again this deputy sheriff was saying terrible things to him, things that would have made me just lose it.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, he told him to go to his own church and pray; do not pray for me.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, he said, I do not think your prayers even get above your head. That is one of the things that the deputy sheriff said. I was struck by how calm this young man was, and as I was watching this, I was thinking, I wonder whatever happened to this guy? How can this guy be so calm? I wonder what happened to him the rest of his life?

So we got off the bus and went in the church, and we were greeted by some of the people that had been involved, and lo and behold, one of the people was this guy, and he got up and told the story from his perspective. And my question was, what was going through your mind at the time? And I said, what was going through your stomach at the time? The thought that you could do this with this guy who just obviously hated him so much, and he was able, again with an incredibly peaceful disposition; the exchange ended when he said, well, is my quarter not worth as much as your quarter? And the deputy sheriff said, I do not want anything to do with your quarter, and get out. Just to talk to this young man who is no longer a young man, he is now in his forties and is still involved in trying to get people voting.

Probably one of the saddest parts of this experience for me was coming home the next day and going to visit a high school in my district, and bringing up this visit that I had, and asking the kids if they knew what the Selma-Montgomery march was all about. And they sort of had an inkling that it was something to do with civil rights, but they did not know much beyond that.

I do not think we should live in the past, but I do not think we should forget the past either. I think it is impor-

tant for the young people in this country to know the price people paid for the right to vote only 30, 35 years ago in this country.

So it was great trip. We were also joined by the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) who was there, and maybe the gentlewoman wants to add her thoughts on the weekend.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much. This obviously is a moving time for all of us. My thoughts were that I actually went to Selma for several reasons; certainly to pay great tribute to my friend and colleague, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), and to say to America, as he has said every single year, that we will never forget. And as we make that statement, which in some sense some people feel that that is a harsh statement, I do not, but some do, that as we never forget, we will continue to try to draw more people into the circle of friendship and humanity to understand how it is so very important to bring about racial harmony; not words that are redundant without substance, but that racial harmony in this country is so very important.

The courageous effort that was made, first let me emphasize the small band of soldiers who marched initially across the Edmond Pettis Bridge when the gentleman was actually brutalized and turned back. That was not the so-called successful march, but it was the march that gathered the attention of America.

For us ever to forget those individuals who in the course of coming to Selma lost their lives, the housewife from Detroit named Viola who came and lost her life and several others came and tried to be part of this. The gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) wound up in a hospital in the North because of the experience that he had to encounter. But yet, as they marched across that bridge, they did not fail to remember that it was what they did that day that might trigger and turn the course of history.

So my experiences coming across the bridge and hearing the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) recount of the question that Josiah Williams asked as to whether he could swim, I looked into that river, my brother, and it was a muddy river, albeit a big river, and I can imagine the choices, how many times we have the fork in the road, if we might look at the New Testament, what might have Jesus thought as he offered himself on the cross in the crucifix, what choices could he have made to turn back, and he did not.

Frankly, I think that this was another singular moment in our history, to be able to gather at Brown Chapel and sing with those individuals who were remembering to see Brown Chapel honored as an historic place of worship, but also of leadership; to hear them commit to the modern-day challenge that we must still fight for those who do not have. I would say as Martin

King came, as you called him those 3 weeks later, these words are very much of meaning to me. He indicated that it was Selma that became a shining moment in the conscience of man. A confrontation of good and evil compressed in the tiny community of Selma generated the massive power to turn the whole Nation to a new course. I do not know if people realize the fact that Mayor Smitherman seems to join you every year, and again he offered his deepest apologies and camaraderie and emotional seeking of forgiveness. I appreciated that and was warmed by that.

I would just simply say to my colleagues, I was very honored to be able to be with you, and I hope that we will engage in some very vigorous discussions and debates about race. I hope that as we talk this evening and bring about a sense of healing, that we realize that healing has to come from acknowledgment and truth.

Just recently we saw in the polls that race and discrimination is still one of the most divisive aspects of our society. And if we learn nothing from the experience of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS) and all who were so heroic that day, that sometimes you have to make the unpopular choices where there are a few that will follow you, but in the ultimate end, the good will prevail.

So I hope as the Voter Rights Act was eventually signed by President Johnson that allowed me to be where I am today, 6,000 or so African Americans who are now elected officials, but more importantly, the doors of opportunity opened, President Johnson saying that their cause must be our cause, too, because it is not just Negroes, but really, it is all of us who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice, and we shall overcome.

So I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I look forward to engaging in more discussion, but I hope that we will be able to rise to accept the unpopular choices to call racism and discrimination where we find it, and to try to work to cure it with our brothers and sisters on the other side of the aisle, and most of all, prevail as JOHN LEWIS prevailed in victory for a harmonious Nation.

□ 1930

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. I think the question as we stand here is where do we go from here.

Ms. JACKSON LEE of Texas. Quite simply, yes.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. All of us represent districts where we have people who want to heal and get together, but I think the challenge we have is, how do we open up peoples' hearts? How do we get them to understand each other?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD).

Mr. HILLIARD. Mr. Speaker, I think the challenge is definitely before us,

how do we bring America together? I think this is the very beginning.

I don't know whether Members had a chance to really discuss the delegation, the diversity of it; but, if you recall, it was bipartisan. We had Members of both parties, the Democrat as well as the Republican party. At the same time, we had the heads of those two parties there; and the congressional delegation was a mixture not only of black and white Members of Congress, but male and female.

I thought this was a very beginning. It was a positive move. I think the people we talked to gave us some insight of some of the changes that they had made in their lives. I speak about Mr. Smitherman, Governor Wallace. We also got to change some minds and hearts in America.

I think it is up to us as leaders, elected officials, to create that type of environment. We need to start somewhere. I cannot think of anyplace better to start than here in the United States Congress.

As the gentleman knows, from this podium some of us have said some things against the opposite party, against opposite Members of this Chamber, that perhaps should not have been said; and oftentimes in heated debates we lose our cool, as they say, and things do not come out as we expect for them to or intended for them to. I think we need to begin here. I think this is the very beginning.

I think we ought to come forth with these types of colloquies every night, every week, or every month. I think we ought to do something to keep the problems that underlie the real problems in America, the issues that underlie the real problems in America, before the public.

If we do not create a dialogue on a continuing basis, those things that harm us more, that hurt us more, will be pushed aside, and they will not be discussed. If you never discuss problems, you never admit that there is a problem; you never solve it. So I think that we need to continue this dialogue. I think this is the very beginning.

Mr. BARRETT of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, let me ask the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. SHERROD BROWN), how do we get people to trust each other? What should we be doing?

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, we saw people at their best and worst. We saw illustrations of that on that trip.

I see the pictures that were on national television of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN LEWIS) and Josea Williams standing two by two as they walked across the bridge, standing there with hundreds of people behind them, neatly lined up, off the street, on the sidewalk so they were not disturbing anybody; and the guard came at them and the police came at them with night sticks and just started beating them up, with horses.

The capacity to absorb that violence is really what changed the hearts and minds of America. Perhaps if they had not been nonviolent, if there had been guns or any kind of weapons or any fighting back, the American public would not have seen the purity, if you will, of the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN LEWIS) and others, of their motives and beliefs and cause. I think that really changed people's hearts.

The Voting Rights Act passed 3 months later overwhelmingly, because of what my friend did; and as the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) said, it was LBJ's speech, "We shall overcome." He would not have been moved to say that if it had not been for the very strong, nonviolent, but strong actions, not weak. Nonviolence is the strongest reaction, because of the strength it takes to love, forgive, and to stand there and take it, if you will.

I think that is part of the answer to the question, I say to the gentleman from Wisconsin, to see both the worst and most brutal in people come out, and then to see the best come out in people's reactions and the best come out in the strength and discipline and love.

It is also I think that we as a people need to listen to each other. It is so rare, as I saw the President's race retreat or town meeting in Akron, which I attended, not far from where I live. What came out there was that white people listened to African Americans talk about themselves, and African Americans listened to white people talk about themselves.

That is something in this society, that as integrated as we are on the surface, we are not very integrated in talking about our personal lives. Whites work with blacks and blacks may be on a softball team with whites, or they may hang around the drinking fountain together, or may even travel with them occasionally, but we do not have the kind of heart to heart discussions: what is my life like, Earl, what is your life like, and talk to each other that way. So much of it is just simple understanding that we really fail to do, I think.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. If the gentleman will continue to yield, Mr. Speaker, I think the gentleman really carved it out for us. Race and the differences with race have been so personal that sometimes we have not reached below the skin, which is sometimes painful.

I want to thank Faith in Politics, the institute that certainly brought us together. I want to thank the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. HILLIARD) for hosting us.

I would like to challenge us to engage in these very personal discussions, because they may translate into constructive legislation. We are not saying that legislation cures all, but to be able to discuss these things and hear both sides.

I think the gentleman's point is well-taken about we were sort of talking at

each other, as some people have perceived in some of these meetings that have been going on. Let us try to talk to each other, and let us find out where we can find common ground.

I leave the gentleman simply with an encouragement. I hope, and I see my colleague, the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. KAREN THURMAN). I hope we will look at this thing called the apology. When you say it, everybody sort of perks up with their views one way or the other.

But let me say that I think an apology for slavery is certainly one that would bring about a vigorous debate, and I hope we would debate it not in anger but that we would get below the skin and really find out what makes people tick, what hurts and helps them, and how we can bring about a true healing, and after healing then comes reconciliation.

I look forward to working with my colleagues, and I am just delighted to be able to be here with them.

Mr. Speaker, as I take my place here in the well of the floor with my colleagues to speak about my participation in the recent march in Selma, Alabama, I am reminded of the solidarity and strength of Congressman JOHN LEWIS and the people who took those courageous steps 33 years ago.

I found the experience of this recent March to be a moving experience. There were those who were there in 1965, and there were those who could not be there in 1965.

I was touched by the faces of the people that I saw there on the bridge. In these faces I saw hope, determination, and pride. And then I thought of the faces of those marching in 1965.

I imagined what led these marchers to gather together in Selma, Alabama in March of 1965. The constant denial of civil rights, the attacking of innocent women and children, the injustices that were routinely handed down by a corrupt and racist judiciary—I say this because one year earlier on July 9, 1964, state circuit judge James Hare issued a ruling which had the effect of enjoining any group of more than three (3) people from meeting in Dallas county—and the constant intimidation of not just private citizens, but state and local officials.

I imagined what these marchers saw as they stood on the Edmund Pettus bridge. They saw the intimidating forces of the law—state troopers and sheriff officers—standing, waiting to savagely beat them after they crossed the bridge.

I imagined the hurt and humiliation that these proud, non violent marchers must have felt—marching towards freedom, only to be savagely attacked by dogs and police; to be showered with tear gas; to be beaten with clubs as though they themselves were enslaved.

I imagined the utter rage that must have gone through the minds of the people who saw their sisters and mothers, fathers, and brothers, beaten as though they were mere property—to be treated simply as the property owner saw fit.

I imagined the shock of the country as Americans watched on TV what African Americans had seen time and time again.

As I stood with the marchers in Selma, Alabama this past weekend, I thought of the

power of the moment—that this march actually occurred only 33 years ago and that here we are, re-creating and reflecting on history.

It was Martin Luther King, Jr. who stated that,

Selma, Alabama . . . became a shining moment in the conscious of man . . . confrontation of good and evil compressed in the tiny community of Selma generated the massive power to turn the whole nation to a new course.

The recent march in Selma was, for me, as if we were telling those who marched in 1965 and the whole wide world that the civil rights movement is still moving. It is moving in the hearts and minds of those of us who carry the torch and flame of justice and liberty in America. It is moving in those of us who were not old enough to march in 1965. It is moving in those of us who greatly benefitted from the courageousness of those who were beaten by the racist police as they tried to cross the Edmund Pettus bridge in 1965. It is moving in the souls of those who support our efforts to hold on to the civil rights that we fought for, and regain the civil rights that are slowly being taken away by renegade courts in America.

The march in Selma thrust this country forward into a new era of voting rights for all Americans. In his televised statement introducing the voting rights bill, it was President Johnson who when speaking of the marchers in Selma stated,

Their cause must be our cause too. Because it is not just Negroes, but really it's all of us who must overcome the crippling legacy of bigotry and injustice. And we shall overcome.

As I stand here tonight, I know that we must begin to prepare for the confrontation that the voting rights acts will engender once again. It will not be easy. For there are those that seek to deny us the simple right to vote. There are those who seek to turn back the clock on civil rights for all Americans.

The marchers in Selma were on the front line. They were fighting not just for themselves, but for all of America; not just black America, but all America.

As we make history here even today, we stand on the front line in the U.S. Congress for civil rights, not just for African Americans, but for all Americans.

As I stood with the marchers in Selma, I thought of the bridges that we have crossed in Houston, Texas, such as proposition "A"—an effort which was designed to eliminate the city's affirmative action contracting program. We crossed that bridge by beating proposition "A" and by letting the entire United States know that civil rights and affirmative action is not only good for the 4th largest city in the U.S., but for the rest of the country.

The march in Selma represents not just the crossing of a bridge, but the crossing over of America from an age of slavery to freedom. It represents the bridge from heartbreak to hope, from poverty to prosperity.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Florida (Mrs. KAREN THURMAN).

Mrs. THURMAN. Mr. Speaker, I apologize for being a little late to enter into this dialogue, because it was probably one of the most important weekends that I spent in my lifetime. I, too, want to thank Faith in Politics for what they did.

I particularly also want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN

LEWIS) for reliving a time in his life that had to be one of difficulty but one that also shaped who he is and what he brings to this Congress today. So, JOHN, I appreciate that.

I also give thanks to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. EARL HILLIARD), as somebody who still lives there, represents that area, and still has to live with the consequences, sometimes, for the time spent. We appreciate the participation that you gave us and the bringing of people together.

Mr. HILLIARD. I thank the gentlewoman.

Mrs. THURMAN. When the gentleman talked about starting here in Congress, I think it is not only starting here in Congress as we try to mend ourselves, between Democrats and Republicans. We have done Hershey, and we tried to bring some, whatever, some composure around here to keep us from fighting so much and doing those kinds of things. It is also the teaching of our own children, the healing within our own hearts, with our own children, starting there from a very young age.

I want to tell the Members a story that happened to me right after, and any time we can talk about this, but not just with my own children. Right after I came back from that weekend, there was a group of students from the University of Florida who came here on an alternative spring break weekend. I do not know how many Members had students from their communities and from their universities that came to different parts of the country to participate in this, where they actually came here.

This group came to work in homeless shelters. They did a battered women's thing, where they painted, took care of kids, and they did those things as an alternative to spring break, instead of going to Daytona Beach 50 miles away, where they could have fun.

They were shocked, first of all, by what they saw in D.C. They had exposed themselves to some degree within their own community but never expected to see what was happening in Washington, D.C.

I relayed my weekend to them, and I said to them, can you imagine in your lifetime walking on the same bridge with the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHN LEWIS) with students your age? I think the thing that struck me the most of this weekend, and I say this to the youth of our country, go out there and see, participate, look at what history is all about.

Because the most striking thing to me, JOHN, was the young woman, I believe she was 14 years old, who was willing to give her life, her life, knowing full well that she was going to walk into one of the most adverse situations of her short 14-year period of time. But she was willing to take a stand at that early age to make a difference in what she would see in history. I have to tell the Members, that struck me like nothing has ever struck me.

I suggested to them that they are young. They have the opportunity to

see this. They are a part of this healing process. They are reaching out right now. They need to go back to their university campuses, and they need to talk about what they saw. They need to start the healing, even within their own university campuses, with what they are seeing.

They said it just kind of tore down all of the things that they had thought about what a homeless person was. So the same thing hits.

The second thing that struck me when we were at the museum, and they talked about the city that had grown from iron. When you walked in there, the first pictures you saw were black and white together talking about work conditions, wage conditions, issues that united them because it was something that they could all understand and believe in.

And only until somebody decided to make it an issue and said, you cannot play cards, you cannot look into their eyes, you cannot do this, you cannot do that, the hatred was never there. The hatred did not start until somebody forced it.

So I think the idea is that if we undo that force of hatred and start to reteach, that we all started off in the same room. We all started off together for the same reasons; but, because of a few individuals, we got to a point where we had to fight, or people had to fight for something that they believed in.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Florida for those words and for taking the time to participate in this. She added so much.

I think what we all are saying tonight is that we must continue the dialogue, continue to talk to each other, continue to move to create the beloved community, an interracial democracy; continue to do what we can to lay down the burden of race.

It is ongoing. We do not necessarily have a blueprint, a road map. We are going down this road for the first time. I think if we can do it in the Congress, we can do it in the larger society. We are the leaders. We should go out and help get our districts and our States to talk about race, and do not be afraid to bring the dirt and the filth from under the American rug, out of the cracks and corners so we can see it, so we can deal with it.

I know the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. JAY DICKEY) was unable to go on the trip, but he had attended several of these meetings. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY).

Mr. DICKEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding to me.

Mr. Speaker, I want to tell the Speaker that the two things that kept me from coming to Alabama on this trip I will forget soon. If I had come, I would have remembered being with you all forever, and I am sorry about that. It is just something that I could not go against my word. But I know what I missed.

What has drawn me to the dialogue with you all and the discussions with you all is the fact that I grew up in Pine Bluff, Arkansas, and during this time was a graduate of law school, practicing law in my hometown; and we thought we were a long way away, but we were not.

But as things have occurred and I am now in public office, it is good for me to sit around in the rooms, in the room as I have done with you, and just go over exactly how we got where we are individually in relationship to race and discrimination and the hatred that we have all seen, particularly in the South.

I do not think you all know what it is like in the North, because in the South, as a white person and as a person from the establishment, I was kept from this controversy quite a bit, only to later go back and live so many regrets. I think you all are helping me in that regard in that you are listening to what we are saying.

One thing that I have, one touch that I had during that time, was a friendship with a man named Wiley Branton.

□ 1915

He practiced law in Pine Bluff. My dad and he were friends. And he kind of brought me along in this. I think he is one of the true heroes of the Little Rock crisis. He does not get mentioned very much and I am so glad to mention it now for our country to hear. He was the glue that held it together until Judge Thurgood Marshall came into Little Rock. He then went to work on the voter registration. I can remember when he was head of the voter registration in the South and he kept saying, yes, we are getting people to register but I am not so sure we are getting them to vote. Then when he was up here in the Justice Department, he was constantly giving his life. Then the Dean of the Howard School of Law, Howard University School of Law. He was telling me some of these things and I was listening but I was not really a part of it. But I do know that he was.

He is now gone. He has passed. But I want his family to know and the people of America to know that his legacy lives on. I want to help in this project, too, for his sake as well as others.

In closing, the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. BARRETT) was saying, where do we go from here? If he is getting a load up, I want to be on, I want to be in the load. I want to be on our way to bringing people together in love in God's name. Thank you.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Let me just thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. DICKEY) for those words. I think tonight we are deeply grateful, in a sense we are more than lucky but really blessed that we have an organization like Faith in Politics Institute that brought us together. It is my hope that as a group that we will stay together and from time to time we will engage in other discussions and dialogue. This is only, as I said, but the beginning.

This is just one step on a very long journey before we create the beloved community and open society.

I want to thank all of my colleagues for participating in this dialogue tonight.

JUDGE MASSIAH-JACKSON

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SHIMKUS). Under a previous order of the House, the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON-LEE) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first, I would like to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the majority leader, for his kindness. Obviously I realize that we are at the time of his special order, but I do want to comment, as a member of the House Committee on the Judiciary, on the concern I had for the withdrawing of the nomination of Judge Massiah-Jackson. Let me first salute Judge Massiah-Jackson for her leadership as the common pleas court judge in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania and for the vigorous and dignified approach that she took to continuing her confirmation.

She was a nominee of the President of the United States, William Jefferson Clinton, and in fact had passed confirmation hearings and was moving to the floor. I do believe that we have a crisis process that is now broken. Our judges are not being appointed and are not completing the confirmation process. The Supreme Court has commented on the appalling backlog of Federal judges and the backlog of cases.

I call this an abomination on the justice system of this country and ask my colleagues who have political differences with the nominees to recognize the separation of powers, the right of the government and the President to appoint and certainly advise and consent.

But let me tell you what I believe the action should be in light of this harmonious debate we have just had. I am calling for the leadership of the NAACP, the National Urban League, the American Civil Liberties Union, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and all who may be considering this great crisis, the National Council of Negro Women, the Coalition of 100 Black Women, the Coalition of 100 Black Men, certainly the Black Women Political Caucus to come together to address this crisis. We do have a crisis. The system is broken. Judges are being rejected and refused. Judge Massiah-Jackson was the last victim of this process.

We cannot have the conservative rule destroy the appointment of Federal judges who deserve to be appointed, who are fair and impartial, a system that should not be tainted by politics. My heart is simply broken for the loss of this woman, the trampling on her constitutional rights as well as her dignity, the disrespect that was shown

her, her losing this process and not going forward for a vote.

I can only say that we have a crisis. All who will hear my voice, I simply ask for you to respond. If we stand together, we can fight against this abomination and restore the dignity to the process and allow us to go forward in the way that we should.

Judge Massiah-Jackson, I thank you for being a true American. You have my support and appreciation. I will commit to you that we will subject no one else to the tragedy of being so defeated, lonely, without the support of so many that were needed.

I thank the gentleman for allowing me this time.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, today, ladies and gentlemen, is a shameful day in the history of our federal judicial appointment process. When the Framers of the Constitution decided that the United States Senate should confirm all Presidential appointees for the federal bench, surely, they could not have imagined that this process would be used for the kind of unmitigated character assassination that Judge Frederica A. Massiah-Jackson has had to endure for the last few months.

The sad fact of this case is that in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania, the cradle of our most fundamental liberties, a place known far and wide as the city of brotherly love, an insufferable crime against justice has been committed. Judge Frederica A. Massiah-Jackson has withdrawn her name today from consideration for the Federal District Court bench in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania.

Since her approval by the Senate Judiciary Committee last October, Judge Massiah-Jackson, a Common Pleas Court magistrate in Philadelphia since 1984, has been the subject of vicious attacks about her record on crime. To me, the most terrible tragedy of this situation is that Judge Massiah-Jackson's critics have been able to use a series of smoke and mirrors tactics in regards to her record to undermine both her qualifications and her credibility. Obviously, these critics have been extremely effective at their task, because they have given Judge Massiah-Jackson the impression that her nomination by the Senate was a lost cause.

My friends, this is a real-life travesty if you take the time to look at the facts. According to today's Philadelphia Inquirer, the Pennsylvania District Attorneys Association, who was among the chief critics of Judge Massiah-Jackson's nomination, used approximately 1% of the judge's actual sitting cases as an evidentiary basis of her unfitness for the federal bench.

The President, in a statement today, described these allegations as "baseless attacks that mischaracterized (the judge's) record without affording (her) an opportunity to respond". Senator ARLEN SPECTER of Pennsylvania similarly noted that Judge Massiah-Jackson was treated unfairly by both her opponents and the Senate Judiciary Committee. Judge Massiah-Jackson, without foreknowledge, was asked by the Senate Judiciary Committee about cases she decided over a decade ago. As Senator SPECTER said in response to this modus operandi by the Committee, "the quintessential point of due process is notice".

Additionally, I find the timing of these charges to be extremely peculiar. The avalanche of charges about Judge Massiah-Jackson's record came several months after both her initial nomination and recommendation for appointment by the Judiciary Committee.

The bottomline, however, is that these charges are completely unfounded. According to a report from the Philadelphia Bar Association, Judge Massiah-Jackson actually imposed sentences above the Pennsylvania sentencing guidelines more frequently than most other Common Pleas Court judges. Actually, in her last year on the bench, Judge Massiah-Jackson was five times more likely than her peers to impose a sentence above the state guidelines. Tell me, ladies and gentlemen, how is this a soft record on crime?

The reality is that this woman's professional record has been destroyed on rumor, unsubstantiated allegations and misplaced accusations. But what can be done for her now? Can her good name ever be restored to its previous standing? Are there any measure of apologies that can be given to restore her dreams? Judge Massiah-Jackson would have been the first female federal judge ever to serve in the Eastern District of Pennsylvania, but now where is her place in history, is it the place of honor that she deserved, or is it one of shame?

Furthermore, I am disgusted by the vast number of people that have ignorantly played a role in this great tragedy of errors. Too many people simply jumped on the bandwagon of attacks in this case without substantive evidence. Judge Massiah-Jackson, wherever you are, I send my deepest apologies to you and your family. And I hope that in the future, this horrible miscarriage of justice does not dissuade other qualified women of your stature from seeking the high judicial offices that their record has earned them. We must end the backlog and conscious scheme to deny Judges appointed by this Democratic Administration their fair hearing and confirmation. Denial of them is a denial of social justice and civil rights for many Americans. It must cease and desist now!

SEARCH FOR VALUES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleagues that will be joining me this evening. It seems like every now and then, once perhaps in every lifetime, there is a sense of a movement on land, a movement of a Nation in search for things of greater meaning and of deeper meaning. I believe that is the case today. I believe America is searching for values that will work in the lives of their families and the lives of their children. I believe that value search that we see going on in America today is characterized accurately, as I like to characterize it, as a search for old ways of doing things.

I believe that it is up to us in a representative democracy to represent the very best of the people that we are privileged to represent and in doing that, it seems to me we must be in

touch with these issues. We must be in touch with the search that we see among our Nation's people. So towards that end of better understanding, I have gathered together a group of Members who have been studying on this matter and we would like to devote the next hour to discussing these issues.

I would like to begin with the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), who will talk about the moral principles as the foundation of a good society.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS).

Mr. PITTS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to begin a discussion with the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), the House majority leader, on the importance of values to our Nation. I thank him for giving me the opportunity to speak today on this issue of vital importance for the survival of our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, moral principles are the foundation of a good society. It is a simple fact that our democracy, the greatest government in history, was founded in large part so that Americans could practice and maintain a strong moral code in their way of life. The first people to colonize this Nation did so for the freedom of religion, not freedom from religion, freedom of religion in order to freely follow a code of ethics to which they were firmly devoted. From the time of the Pilgrims we have associated the creation of America with the privilege and responsibility of applying moral principles.

Even the modern anti-tax movement can trace its roots directly back to a moral principle present in colonial times that every penny and every power that government gets comes at the expense of personal freedom and personal opportunity.

In fact, this principle helped spur the American Revolution.

Mr. Speaker, we have a founding document in this Nation, a birth certificate, if you will, called the Declaration of Independence. This declaration is different from many others that have been issued around the world. The primary difference is the preamble that distinguishes it from all other declarations of independence. This preamble has certain principles that I would like to mention. The fact that, and I would like to quote it, the fact that these principles are highlighted, I think, are instructive.

This is what it says: We hold these truths to be self-evident that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are instituted among men deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed and that whenever any form of government becomes destructive to these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles

and organizing its powers in such form as to them shall seem most likely to affect their safety and happiness.

Now, that is not the whole preamble, but in that part of the preamble we see that these principles that we are endowed by our Creator, that all men are created equal and that we are endowed by the Creator with certain inalienable rights, that these are God-given rights, rights not given to us by government, rights that the government cannot give and rights they cannot take away, they are God given rights and the purpose of government is to secure these God given rights, life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness.

With rights also must come responsibility. Our Nation is built on the principle of liberty. Our government exists with our consent. We choose to augment, revise and improve our laws and the very structure of our government routinely. With this privilege comes a mandate that we tend to liberty with care and caution and prudence.

We have another founding document, the one that we all swear to support and defend. It is called the U.S. Constitution. And that Constitution is the oldest national Constitution in the world, the granddaddy of them all. And it begins with these words: We the people of the United States in order to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquility, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity do ordain and establish this Constitution for the United States of America.

We the people, as one of the prime ministers who spoke to this Congress in past years said, the most important words in the English language, the most important three words, we the people. And in those days when kings were sovereign and people were subjects, to say that we the people are sovereign and we only give you the government certain limited powers, that we the people do ordain, was a revolutionary concept. Of course we know that our Republic, our constitutional form of government cannot work in a vacuum and it should not work in a back room. It requires citizens to be involved with their representatives in order to represent them adequately.

But when we take a look at other forms of government, we realize what a powerful and beneficial system we have. When other nations were created, the citizens were thought to be subjects. They were so much chattel from which the hierarchy could prosper, and around the world governments created just a few decades ago and some longer than that, centuries ago, forced men and women to be pawns for the state. The people live at the discretion of the government. But not in America. In America the government lives at the discretion of the people. As we see when we look around the world, our democracy truly is a blessing.

Now, it is easy to argue that things have run amok. We have too much taxation. We have an overly large Federal bureaucracy. We have an administration that takes power away from families. It is pretty clear that we have taken the benefits of democracy and used them to support bad policies. But it is not the system that is flawed. It has been a lax approach to following the moral principles which created this Nation and made it strong.

In 1776, in my home State of Pennsylvania, our State Constitution decreed in its preamble, and I quote, we the people of Pennsylvania, grateful to Almighty God for the blessings of civil and religious liberty and humbly invoking his guidance, do ordain and establish this Constitution.

In that same period, the 18th century philosopher Montesquieu wrote, and I quote, the deterioration of every government begins with the decay of principles upon which it was founded. And in current times we have seen that very decay in our moral principles. We have stopped advocating biblical principles upon which this Nation was founded. Instead, we have adopted relativist stances which are far easier to defend, but which are far more difficult for the progress and security of our Nation. Thus we have seen the decay. We live in a society where infidelity is either glamorized in the media or accepted as benign and inconsequential by our politicians.

□ 2000

Tonight, 4 out of 10 children who go to bed will go to bed in a home in which their father does not reside in America. Tonight, drug abuse is on the rise among our youth, and child crime is more prevalent today than at any other time in the history of our Nation. As we have walked away from the moral code which binds this Nation together, we see our society fraying at the edges. We must get back to those values that created our Union for the sake of our Union.

George Washington, our first President, was a man of great moral character. It was his capacity for self-discipline and willingness for service to the American Nation which ultimately allowed this Nation to be founded. George Washington said this, and I quote: "We ought to be no less persuaded that the propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a Nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained."

Washington's message was clear: We as a Nation can thrive by the adherence to a fundamental moral code. It gave Washington the vision to lead us into the era of democracy. Conversely, as we have seen, we as a Nation can fall with the disregard of that code.

This Nation was founded on the premise that fidelity to God was honorable and ought to be encouraged, not hindered, by government. Sadly, we now have portions of the government

fighting alongside elite liberal factions in order to portray faith in God as a radical, irresponsible act.

While the founding fathers used prayer as a guiding influence in their fight for freedom, we now hide behind false legal pretense to deny our responsibility to gain inspiration and direction from prayer. The first act of the very first Continental Congress in 1774 was to pass a resolution as they met in Carpenter's Hall.

They did not meet, the first Continental Congress, in the old statehouse in Philadelphia. They did not want to plot against the Crown on Crown property. They met next door in Carpenter's Hall, 57 men, and their first act was to pass a resolution calling on each session, every day, to begin with prayer, to be led by a local clergyman.

They had heard a false rumor that Boston had been cannonaded. The next day they invited the vicar of Christ Church in Philadelphia, the Reverend John Dushay, to come and lead the prayer. And in those days, when they had prayer, it was not like we have a 1- or 2-minute prayer, his session lasted over 2½ hours. He first read from Psalm 35. And if my colleagues will remember the rumor of Boston being cannonaded, and in the day of slow communication they did not know it was false, and so we can understand his reading.

And John Adams, who was there, wrote to his wife Abigail. There are a lot of letters that they exchanged. And he described this scene, and it is portrayed in a picture on the wall in Carpenter's Hall, if anyone visits there. He said, Washington and Rutledge and Lee, and he named some others on their knees; beside them the old gray pacific Quakers of Philadelphia; and then behind the old pacific Puritans of England, with tears in their eyes. And he ended, "It was enough to melt a heart of stone." The first act of the first Congress on their knees in prayer. Something that might be a little foreign to us today.

But heroes like Washington, Adams and Lincoln used their lives to demonstrate their effort to respond to their responsibilities as men of faith. They fought for the concept of freedom with their demonstrations of honor and integrity, and, as a result, a great Nation was born, developed and survived great challenge.

Abraham Lincoln, during a time when our Nation struggled to recreate itself, affirmed his devotion to the core principles begotten by faith. He said, and I quote, "Intelligence, patriotism, Christianity and a firm reliance on Him, who has never yet forsaken this favored land, are still competent to adjust in the best way all our present difficulty."

Our Constitution embodies core moral principles. It creates a system where individual effort and integrity are rewarded. In it, men are free to support those with similar moral con-

victions. It rewards those who incorporate their faith-based responsibilities of honesty, hard work, devotion, fidelity and charity. It works to create a system which works for and through morality and responsibility.

The founders of our Nation recognized the importance of faith and honesty in government, requiring officeholders to publicly swear an oath before assuming governmental responsibility. And this was not a simple act of pomp and circumstance. This was a declaration of a bond with their Creator. It was a demonstration that honesty and faith are prerequisites for governing.

According to Sir William Blackstone, who was the great jurist, and he was the one who wrote the commentaries that all lawyers back in those days studied to become attorneys, he said this: "The belief of a future state of rewards and punishments, the entertaining just ideas of main attributes of the Supreme Being, and a firm persuasion that he superintends and will finally compensate every action in human life, all which are revealed in the doctrines of our Savior, Christ, these are the grand foundations of all judicial oaths, which call God to witness the truth of those facts which perhaps may be only known to Him and the party attesting. All moral evidences, therefore, all confidence in human veracity must be weakened by apostasy, and overthrown by total infidelity. Wherefore, all affronts to Christianity, or endeavors to depreciate its efficacy, in those who once professed it, are highly deserving of censure."

Mr. Speaker, the freedom to which we owe so many is a direct result of adherence to divinely inspired moral values. These values made us a great Nation. And as we have recently seen, there is an inverted relationship between our Nation's success and its rejection of traditional values. The further we avoid making the tough choices of honesty, fidelity, honor, self-reliance and the incorporation of our faith into our daily lives, the further we slide down the path of relativism.

As we face a new millennium, we must work to come back to those principles. Our Nation cannot afford to slide much further. Redemption can come from reacquainting ourselves with these morals, but this action must occur soon. For the sake of our Union, we cannot wait.

I thank the gentleman for letting me participate tonight and yield back to him.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his participation. And, Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) has set the stage for us. We have a Nation that was founded on the highest of moral principles and faith, as, in fact, expressed and practiced by our Founding Fathers.

And while we all know that we cannot by law make a Nation good, I think it is a very clear fact that if a Nation is to legislate law that reflects the best

of its people, it can do so, and, in doing so, it can encourage those traits of human conduct and behavior, value, morality and belief that are of greatest service to a Nation.

With respect to these questions, of how we might legislate in such a way to be an encouragement to our citizens, we are privileged to have with us tonight the distinguished whip, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TOM DELAY), who has studied these issues, and studies them well, as we apply them to his critique of legislative offers that come before the body and the decision-making process by which we determine what legislation we should bring forth.

At this time, Mr. Speaker, I yield to my distinguished colleague.

Mr. DELAY. I thank the distinguished majority leader, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the gentleman for bringing this special order that I think is so important, particularly in the beginning of this session of Congress.

I really appreciate the presentation done by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS). For all of those in the Nation today that are talking about the fact that character does not matter or that what one does in their private life has no affect on their public life, I hope they will go back either to the Internet or to their library and pick up tomorrow's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and read the presentation by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, because he so eloquently points out the foundation of values to our country and their importance.

I really appreciate this opportunity to join my colleagues and the majority leader this evening in this very, very important discussion. And as we are talking, a friend of the majority leader's and mine is somewhere in the Capitol leading a tour of this Capitol, a gentleman that is vice president of the Texas Republican Party and a fellow by the name of David Barton, who is the symbol of values, particularly Texas values, that represents what we are trying to say here tonight. We are very appreciative to have him here.

I have been asked to discuss with the American people, Mr. Speaker, our legislative agenda and how it reinforces our family values. But we have to first ask the question what are family values? And according to the dictionary, the definition of a value is something intrinsically valuable and desirable.

Now, most Americans believe that a strong family structure is intrinsically valuable and desirable. This is not a new belief. Indeed, an ancient philosopher once said, the root of the state is in the family. And likewise, the root of the United States lies in the families of the United States. But for too long the family structure has been under attack. It has been under attack from many different quarters.

Today's culture all too often designates the family as the building block of our civilization. As the gentleman from Pennsylvania points out, divorce rates continue to climb in this

country. Child abuse and neglect has become a national epidemic in this country. Drug abuse tears families apart. And the government has become, in many ways, an unwitting accomplice in the process.

The government continues to take more money from middle-class families in the form of taxes and regulations. If we add up local, State and Federal taxes and the cost of regulations, today the average American family is forced to fork over more than 50 percent of its income to the government. That means 50 cents out of every dollar that a family makes today goes to the government.

No wonder it takes one parent to work for the government while another parent works for the family. This puts additional pressure on a two-parent family, and all too often one parent is forced to work to pay off the government while the other works to support the family.

That money pays for two unnecessary things: One is a bloated Washington bureaucracy, and the other is a misguided welfare state that creates a culture of dependency that quite often undermines the family structure in many of our most fragile communities.

We have taken the first step to reverse this process. In the last Congress we reformed the welfare state to give families a hand up rather than a hand-out. And that welfare law has been a great success. In fact, there are fewer people on welfare today than there were in 1970, and I think that is quite an accomplishment. But we must not rest.

We are committed as a majority in this House to creating conditions that support strong family structures in all our communities. Our legislative agenda has five components:

First, we want to reduce the government burdens put on our families; and we want to eliminate things like the marriage penalty in our Tax Code. Our Tax Code actually has an incentive for divorce. I just feel that that is so ridiculous, and we are going to change it.

Our current labor laws also make it difficult for workers to substitute vacation hours for additional pay. If a mother or father wants to spend more time with their children in lieu of cash, that should be their choice, not the choice of some Federal Government.

We want to give more choices to parents for child care. We want seniors to have more choices for their retirement security. Giving families more choices and ending government policies that take away those choices is a very critical part of our family-friendly agenda.

A second pillar of this agenda comes with our efforts to improve education. Some of our Nation's public schools are getting better and better every day, but many others are getting worse. Parents need to have that option to send their kids to good schools. Good schools are accountable to parents. They maintain discipline. They use their resources wisely. Providing par-

ents with school choice and making those schools face competition are innovative ways to improve education in this Nation.

The majority leader, who is standing here, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY), has been a vocal proponent of a D.C. scholarship program that will give parents more choices in this beleaguered school system in Washington, D.C.

□ 2015

Now the President has an opportunity by signing this legislation to help at least 2,000 underprivileged kids in the D.C. area to have access to a better education. Making certain that more dollars go to the classroom rather than to Washington education bureaucracy is another important way we can improve education.

My colleague, the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS), has introduced a bill that does just that. Under committee consideration right now, the Dollars to the Classroom Act block grants 30 Federal education programs and requires that at least 95 percent of those funds go straight to the place that they are needed most, at the kids in the classroom.

We will also be working on providing middle-class parents with a tax-free education IRA. This will give parents the ability to save for their kids' grammar school and secondary school education. I think these are fitting ways to show our commitment to an improved education.

A third pillar of our family-friendly agenda involves the war on drugs. Congressman DENNY HASTERT from Illinois, working with Congressman ROB PORTMAN of Ohio and other Members in our conference, has designed a strategy to put some teeth in our war on drugs. We must not lose another generation to violence and drugs. We need aggressive enforcement of our drug laws, we need better interdiction at our borders, and we should build on the innovative efforts of faith-based programs that have been successful in ending drug addiction.

Protecting the sanctity of life is the fourth pillar of our pro-family agenda. The President vetoed legislation that outlawed the barbaric partial birth abortion procedure. That was a shame. Because, as Senator MOYNIHAN from New York put it, this procedure is very close to infanticide. We will work to override that veto this year, later on this year.

The culture of death that surrounds partial-birth abortion and assisted-suicide laws must be stopped. We should also stop government funding for groups that promote abortions abroad, and we should be exporting policies that celebrate life, not policies that promote death.

The final pillar of this values-based agenda comes with protecting people of faith in America and across the world. All too often people of faith are oppressed and condemned rather than respected and welcomed.

One example, of course, is in China. They have persecuted Christians, they have torn down churches, and they have imprisoned peace-loving pastors who only want to promote the gospel. We should continue to put pressure on the Chinese and other governments that practice religious persecution to allow more religious freedom.

We should also end policies in America that unfairly discriminate against people of faith. The courts have changed our Constitution by distorting the original intent of the First Amendment. The First Amendment to the Constitution says, and I quote, Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof.

There is no separation of church and state in that statement. That does not mean that the Founding Fathers wanted us to ignore God or to forbid our children to pray. We believe that children should be allowed to pray in our schools. We should talk about the moral basis of our Government. We should be allowed to post the Ten Commandments in Federal buildings.

Moses looks down on this Chamber every day. Right over that door, I am looking at the face of Moses; and he gazes down at the Speaker's chair. We open each of our sessions with a prayer to God. We should not allow the judicial branch to stamp out religious expression in other areas of the government.

My colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. ISTOOK) has introduced a religious freedom amendment that reestablishes the people's right to acknowledge God according to the dictates of conscience, and it has been reported out of committee and should see floor action in this session.

So let me just conclude by saying that some liberals have called us the "do-nothing Congress," and maybe we are the "do-nothing-they-like Congress." But we are a busy Congress, doing the things that support the values of this country, the values that have built this country. And it is wrong to call us a "do-nothing Congress." We are working on a value-based agenda that will strengthen families into the next century.

I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARMEY) for yielding me the time.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his comments. I so much appreciate his hard work and his clearly focused understanding on what is indeed of value to the American people.

Mr. Speaker, we are blessed by our creator with certain inalienable rights. Certainly, liberty and personal freedom is the greatest blessing of all; and our Government should be protective of that freedom. But I think anyone who is clear and judicious in the understanding of freedom understands that we really can only be free if we purchase that freedom through the exercise of personal responsibility.

Tonight we have with us Congressman J.D. HAYWORTH of Arizona, who

has studied on this matter a great deal and wants to share with us some of his reflections on the relationship between freedom and responsibility. At this time, I yield the floor to my colleague from Arizona.

Mr. HAYWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished majority leader.

Mr. Speaker, as we spend time together here in this Chamber tonight and by extension electronically with citizens of this great Nation from coast to coast and beyond, one cannot help but remark on our proud heritage and our history. And I would thank very much not only the majority leader but our colleague from Pennsylvania, where so much of the early history of this Nation took place, and the distinguished Majority Whip for offering his thoughts as well.

Indeed, as the Whip explained, Mr. Speaker, from the vantage point of the Speaker's chair we can see the visage of Moses represented here in this Chamber looking down on these proceedings. And indeed, Mr. Speaker, above the chair where you sit are inscribed the words, "In God we trust."

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues and fellow citizens, it is important to reaffirm what it is we believe, to stand and celebrate the notion that we are free in this constitutional republic to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience.

Indeed, citizens are free to choose not to worship God. But even as we acknowledge that freedom, we must also acknowledge that tremendous history and tremendous responsibility that is inexorably part of the American experience. Here we stand free to express our ideas, our convictions, our philosophies in this Chamber; and citizens around the country are doing it I think tonight in a City Council meeting in Flagstaff, Arizona. Similar meetings may be going on in Fargo, North Dakota, or in Philadelphia, the cradle of our liberty, as our colleague from Pennsylvania pointed out. And undergirding all these notions are firm and solid principles.

I could not help but reflect, as I heard our colleague from Pennsylvania offer his historic observations, of the actions involving our Founders, not only the actions taken to win our independence but subsequently the actions taken at that constitutional convention at what became Independence Hall, actions that were so incredible Catherine Drinker Bowen called the entire proceeding in her great and definitive work the "Miracle at Philadelphia." And from that heritage and from those principles springs the deep convictions of our citizenry.

Polls can never take the place of principles, and yet polling information offers insight into the psyche and indeed the souls of America. And in stark contrast to some of the polling results that have been offered by various media outlets in recent days, there are important things we can see from surveys taken across our country.

A Terence survey reports that 71 percent of Americans polled in this Nation believe that our Nation confronts a moral crisis. Contrast that with only 16 percent of Americans believing there is an economic crisis. So, indeed, even as there are times of economic plenty, citizens of this country are concerned that there are problems with the morality and the fealty and the convictions which we attempt to affirm and uphold each day.

Pew Research Center suggested that a decline in moral values was the top problem facing our Nation, three times higher than economic insecurity.

Indeed, Mr. Speaker, as we come and we celebrate our diversity in the fact that many of us celebrate and worship God according to many different traditions, I know that many of us pray for the wisdom of Solomon, that we might, in taking on these constitutional responsibilities, understand that with freedom comes those responsibilities. And indeed, those unique circumstances the constitutional republic offers us in this role in this Chamber are mirrored by responsibilities that belong to each and every citizen. Other speakers have bemoaned the fact that four out of 10 children in America tonight will go to sleep in a home where their father is not present.

Our distinguished Whip reaffirmed legislative priorities that help affirm the principles that have made this Nation great. We can see this not only in remembering and holding in reverence the words of our Constitution but also on the Nation's bookshelves, as so many Americans seek out supplements, if you will, to scripture on the notion of spirituality.

Annual sales of religious books has topped \$1 billion in this Nation in 1997. The sales increase of these items grows at a dramatic pace, nearly 100 percent over the last 3 years. Indeed, the best-seller that remains number one on every list in this great country remains the Holy Bible. Last year, nearly 30 million Bibles were sold in the U.S., far dwarfing the sales of any other book in our Nation's history.

Indeed, as we stand and celebrate that fact, we cannot help but note that, in this world, as others begin their business day, indeed, across the date-line, as others live in another day temporally, sadly there are areas in this world where that very freedom to pick up Holy Scripture is abridged, where that notion is denied. How more remarkable, then, is this great constitutional republic.

Indeed, even as Americans are concerned about a moral crisis, there are signs that America in general, from Main Street to Wall Street, seeks the help of the supreme creator.

In new technology, matters of faith are leaping to providence. On the Internet, the Christianity on-line web page is named as one of the most popular web sites on America Online.

In my former profession of broadcasting, we have all witnessed the phenomenal success of Dr. Laura

Schlessinger who has taken to the airwaves to reaffirm the simple notions of faith and family and fealty to those principles which made us great and to the responsibilities engendered in taking on fatherhood, in taking on marriage, in taking on a leadership position, not only at home but in a fellowship of faith or in a business or, dare I say it, in a position within government.

Mr. Speaker, I have learned a lot in traveling the width and breadth of the Sixth Congressional District of Arizona, an area in square mileage roughly the size of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. A message continues to come from my constituents, many of whom had forebearers who came to what was a relatively desolate place at one point in our history, folks with the help of technology and faith literally made the desert bloom. It has given flower to freedom but, with that, a notion that is not peculiar to the West but reaffirmed there that with freedom comes responsibility, and those responsibilities we dare not shirk.

The other note I have heard, Mr. Speaker, from my constituents is this notion that while there are those who say you cannot legislate morality, it is also true that you cannot exercise moral leadership without a firm foundation of moral authority. So that is what we seek.

Even as we celebrate the differences in our religious expressions and backgrounds, even as we celebrate the fact that we will not all speak with one voice on every issue when we come into this Chamber or stand in this well or cast a vote on behalf of those we represent, but we give thanks for the opportunity to be here to be able to worship according to the dictates of our own conscience, to discuss these matters freely and openly, and to have the opportunities to see that we can address the so-called moral crisis with a commitment to seek wisdom, with a commitment in the words of the prophet Micah to do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with our God.

With that, I yield back to our distinguished majority leader.

□ 2030

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman for his contribution. It is truly appreciated. Mr. Speaker, we will follow up the distinguished gentleman from Arizona with the distinguished gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT), who will give us further reflections on this subject.

Mr. TALENT. I thank the majority leader for yielding to me. It is always hard to follow my friend from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, we are a country that has been blessed with great prosperity. With our affluence has come more choices for all the American people. The more choices we have, the more important it is to exercise responsibility along with our freedom. Mr. Speaker, the law does not directly legislate responsibility typically. It does not re-

quire directly that you engage in moral activity. It just says you cannot engage in activity that hurts other people. There is no reason why the law should do that. Typically there are very important consequences that follow socially if you do exercise these choices in an irresponsible or an immoral way.

There is no law, Mr. Speaker, against lying. If you lie too much, you are going to find yourself without any friends. There is no law against borrowing too much. But if you do, you typically end up losing everything. The problem is not that our laws do not, except in very limited areas, legislate responsibility along with freedom; the problem is in the last generation or so, we have allowed government policies to develop that actually detach responsibility from freedom, that actually seduce people into exercising their freedom in a way that is irresponsible because it at least holds out the prospect of immunizing them from the natural and normal consequences that typically follow from making bad choices. We see that in a lot of areas of the law.

The criminal justice system over the last generation developed in a way that tended to treat criminals as if they were the victim and so sent the messages to young people that they were not responsible for their behaviors, that if they did wrong it was because they were the victim of an unjust society. The tax system that punishes savings and investment by taxing it tends to reward people who consume and spend everything that they earn.

And then the subject, the area that I want to discuss tonight very briefly, Mr. Speaker, the welfare system, which is perhaps the best example we have of a system that over the years made it harder and harder for decent people to live honest, responsible lives. Today we are living and they are living with the consequences of that system. Mr. Speaker, in the immediate postwar era in the late 1940s, the poverty rate in this country was around 30 percent. It declined steadily for the 20 years following that until 1965 when it reached 15 percent. It was at that point that the Federal Government declared war on poverty. The Federal Government decided that it was going to help poor people in this country, a natural and good impulse. But it did it by providing the wrong incentives.

Mr. Speaker, there are two programs, if you will, two things that typically over the generations have gotten Americans out of poverty, that has gotten my parents out of poverty, that gets people out of poverty or got their parents out of poverty, because, Mr. Speaker, almost everybody in America either grew up poor or had a parent who grew up poor or at least had a grandparent who grew up poor. So this is not something that most people are not familiar with. Those two things that tend to get people out of poverty the quickest in this country are work and family, typically marriage. The

Federal Government decided in 1965 that it was going to condition a very substantial package of assistance on people doing neither of those things, a package of assistance that grew until it reached \$8,000 to \$15,000 a year in cash and other kinds of benefits, an amount of money that seems very, very large to a person coming from a low income background. What the government said in effect to people was, "Look, if you don't work, if you get married without having children, we will provide you with a large package of assistance." And so we effectively changed the behavior that people would otherwise engage in. If people wanted to get out of poverty in the way my parents did it, that is the way that requires a lot of faith, a lot of work, a lot of long-term thinking, a lot of responsibility. You have to decide that in America, you can make it out by working, make it out by staying in school as long as you can, make it out by raising a family after you have married someone who has made a commitment to doing that. That is one alternative that was available to people from lower incomes. Then the other alternative the government was offering was, "Now, wait a minute, you can have an apartment of your own, you can have health care, you can have food stamps and you can have walking around money. All you have to do is not get a job and have a child without being married."

Then we were surprised at the results, Mr. Speaker. The poverty rate in 1965 when the Federal Government declared war on poverty was 15 percent. In 1995, 30 years later, it was still 15 percent. Only we had changed the poverty from something that was transient, that typically went away after a generation, to a situation where people were mired in dependence on the government without the family or neighborhood support that had made it possible for them to get out of poverty. What we got was not a decrease in poverty but a vast increase in the out of wedlock birthrate, from about 6 percent in 1965 to about 32 percent in 1995.

What a sad thing, Mr. Speaker. I talk very often to teen moms. What a sad thing, because if you are 16, 17, 18 years old, you have had a child, you are not married, you have not finished school, you do not have any family support, well, then you really are not going to get out of poverty very quickly probably, and it is heroic that so many young people are trying, notwithstanding the incentives in this system. They wake up after a couple of years and realize that what they were seduced to do is a dead end.

We changed that with an act in 1996 that was aptly called the Personal Responsibility Act of 1996. We are already experiencing the good consequences of that as caseloads around the country are dropping on average 20 to 25 percent, something that has not happened in the postwar era. The system, Mr. Speaker, was such that as my friend

the majority leader said one time, "We need to reform welfare, not because people on welfare are abusing the system but because the system is abusing people on welfare."

Let me just say, Mr. Speaker, that that bill should be a model of what we try and do and in fact have done in other areas. We have reformed substantially the incentives in the criminal justice system. We have made a start in changing the tax system. We need to continue linking once again the law to responsibility, linking once again the responsibility that people normally have for the decisions that they make. That is the way to rebuild America. That is what we are trying to do here. That is the new consensus that is emerging in Washington. Mr. Speaker, it has been a pleasure to declaim on this subject for a few minutes.

Mr. ARMEY. I thank the gentleman again. Mr. Speaker, here we are. We have had a pretty decent, as we like to say, truck driver's review of a lot of the things very important to the American people. The gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS) came in earlier and talked about the founders of this great Nation, how they were governed by faith, born mostly from our Judeo-Christian traditions; how serious were such words as honor, duty, dignity, respect, decency, morality, ethics, truthfulness, and how much that was the foundation on which this great Nation was built. We have had some look at the character and the nature of the American people. For all our foibles, Mr. Speaker, we really have not as a Nation strayed that far from those wonderful, courageous, devoted, dedicated people that founded this great Nation. We are still fundamentally good people, and we are still fundamentally people that depend upon rules of law and rules of governance around which we might organize ourselves and our personal lives and our relationship to one another. We do look to the government. Then it comes to some of us to be part of the government.

I was struck today, I had for me an incredible privilege. I actually was able to substitute for the Speaker of the House today in the business of swearing in a new Member of our body, 435 people, all of whom are given a trust, a sense of responsibility, a certain amount of confidence and faith and expectation placed in each and every one of us. I suppose maybe we do not stop and think back about how big a deal that is in our lives and how big it can be in the lives of others who have trusted us. I am sure the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. CAPPS) did today on this day of her first day of work as a Member of the Congress of the United States, charged with the responsibility of writing law.

I think what we must do is ask ourselves, what is our responsibility? Who are we and what are we doing here? We look for examples. We in Texas, for example, like to cite our favorite Speaker Sam Rayburn, a man of great sage

advice. We read the history books and we know of other great Speakers. We know of other great Members. We have read Profiles in Courage and we all hope that someday we might be included in the same way. But how do we decide the model that will govern us? What a difficult thing to reconcile the authority and the responsibility placed in us with the fact that what it is we are responsible for is to writing the law by which a Nation of free people will govern itself.

It begins, I believe, with our first knowing the goodness of the American people and first committing ourselves to represent the best of the American people, not their fears and not their doubts and not their reservations or their jealousies or their envies or their angers, but what is truly the best of their hopes and their dreams, their abilities, their contributions, their citizenship and, yes, indeed, their faith. So we look for examples. It is not enough, I believe, for us to be here and be satisfied that the work we do is good. I think we must go beyond that and conduct ourselves in our own personal life either on the job or off such that others that look to those of us that were given this responsibility and this privilege and yes, this authority, will see in us an example of someone that is good, that is at once an example that can be held up before your children and at the same time an encouragement to those children to live out in their lives the best of all that goodness that was placed in each and every one of those precious children by a wonderful God and Creator who had the generosity to create us after His own image.

So where do we look? Let me suggest that we look to that Creator, that most wonderful Creator who must have had his frustrations, do you not suppose, with the children of Abraham, as we read in the Old Testament, as they wandered and they struggled and they were serving and they vacillated between faith and doubt? How many times do you suppose they let their God and their Creator down with their inability to understand or their inability to accept or their inability to practice in their own lives a disciplined faith? Yet He never left them. How many times have we said, you and I, in our own childhood and we have heard it from our own children, have we not, "Well, if God is so powerful, why doesn't he just stop me from doing those things?"

□ 2045

So if I was bad, it must be his fault. But that is what freedom is all about, is it not, giving us both the freedom to do, to choose, and the responsibility that goes with it.

As I read in the Old Testament about the struggle and the search of the children of Abraham and the expressions of hope by their God and their Creator, our God and our Creator, I am struck by something. The Lord God Almighty

looked down on these people searching for a way, and He said, I hope My children will know My laws and obey them so things will go well for them. He did not say, so that they would know My power and know My authority and know I am in command here. His hope was about His children, that they would know His laws and obey them so things would go well with them.

Lord God Almighty did not give us many laws, Mr. Speaker. He gave us a lot of helpful suggestions, many of which can be found in Proverbs, my favorite book of the Bible. So many helpful suggestions, but very few laws. It should not be hard for us to remember them. But Lord God knew His people. He knew the goodness that was in these people. He knew their needs, and He wrote only those laws that were necessary so that a free people, knowing his laws and obeying them, would find that things would go well for them.

Maybe, Mr. Speaker, as we practice the authorities and the responsibilities and the privilege granted to us by people that have elected us to these positions, maybe someday if we are successful, we can draw from that model; we can look back on our careers, we can look at the way we have conducted ourselves as an example before others, and hopefully, as an encouragement before others, and look at our legislative record, and maybe we can say, I hope my children know and obey my laws so things will go well for them. And perhaps, if we can have any confidence, we might in some way emulate that wonderful kindness and great charity given to us by a God who is of such generosity that He would create us humble beings in His own image.

It is a serious matter we have discussed here this evening. We have not done justice to it. We find ourselves leaving this hour's discussion, even after the wonderful contributions given by the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PITTS); the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. HAYWORTH); the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. TALENT); and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DELAY), and my own meager offering here, probably with more questions than answers. But are they not great questions, Mr. Speaker? Questions about the goodness of a people in a land that was created by people to do honor to the greatest gift of all, the gift of freedom from Lord God Almighty, our Creator.

CONTINUING STATE OF EMERGENCY IN AFRICAN-AMERICAN EDUCATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BURR of North Carolina). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 7, 1997, the gentleman from New York (Mr. OWENS) is recognized for 60 minutes.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I want to talk about the continuing state of emergency in African American education. I have come here many times to

talk about education, and I may seem repetitious, but I only come because I do not see enough movement among the decisionmakers at any level to deal with the emergency that we confront in the African American community. I do not see enough movement at the Federal level, I do not see it at the State level, I do not see it at the local level either, and I think that it sort of contradicts the intense feeling of the American people about education. They really want us to make some movements in a more rapid and a more positive way toward resolving some of the problems that our schools face.

Despite the fact that the polls continually show that the American people rank education as a priority problem, there is this slow movement, and the problem faced by the mainstream community is serious enough. However, the problem faced by the African American community, where most of our young people who are school age are concentrated in the big cities of America, in the inner-city communities, they are staggering. The schools in many of our big cities are literally basket cases, and that is no exaggeration.

I do want to punctuate my remarks before I go into a more thorough discussion of the emergency in the African American community, the education emergency, I want to punctuate my remarks with some good news. There is some good news that I would like to share with the people out there whose common sense has helped to make this happen. The common sense of the American people keeps bubbling up and getting to some of our top decisionmakers, and I think that it is finally breaking through to our top decisionmakers that construction, school construction, is at the heart of any effort to improve our schools.

School construction and school repairs and things related to the simple matter of physical safety, and adequate equipment in the schools, those matters are central to any improvement efforts we make. One cannot really seriously talk about reducing class sizes and having a better ratio of students to teachers unless we also build additional classrooms. These are common-sense matters, but there are people who want to move on to reduce the sizes of classes, but they do not want to talk about construction. That costs too much money. They want to deal with a nonsolution.

If we do not have the classrooms, and we talk about funds for more teachers, then that is a nonsolution. More teachers cannot decrease the ratio of students to teachers if they do not have a classroom to go into to teach those students.

So the good news is that at the meeting this afternoon, Vice President GORE announced that on April 8 there will be a national forum on the whole issue of school construction, a national electronic forum. We are going to have a big event here in Washington that

will be broadcast all across the country, and various groups will be meeting, and satellites will tie in some of the discussion.

It is a very important development because it means that as far as the President is concerned, as far as this administration is concerned, they are not slacking, they are not hesitating to go forward with their push to get something accomplished that is significant in school construction in this year.

I was disappointed that it fell off the radar screen last year. Somewhere the negotiations between the President and the majority party in the Congress, construction got lost and was taken off the table. It is quite clear that the President does not intend to take it off the table this time, and one indication of the commitment of this administration to a construction program is the fact that on April 8 there will be a national forum, a national discussion.

Everybody is invited to do something at their own local level. I think Congress at that time will be on recess, but we are invited to do things back in our district, and I certainly plan to make certain that we do something of high visibility in my district to link up with the administration's effort to put construction, school renovation and things related to providing safe physical facilities for our children on the front burner in everybody's mind.

We need to raise the level of awareness still of the voters and the average citizen, but I think they may already be ahead of the decisionmakers in our city councils and the decisionmakers in the State legislature and some of the decisionmakers here in Congress who are still not aware of the fact that this is crucial. Construction and everything related to physical facilities is crucial.

The President's proposal is for \$22 billion in loans. The loan program that was proposed last year has been made better by the fact that the last year's proposal talked of low interest rates and the Federal Government subsidizing so that those low interest rates would be there for the districts that chose to borrow to build schools. This time, the proposal says that there will be no interest rates. In other words, no interest will be charged. The principal is all that the locality will have to pay back. They are going to subsidize through tax credits. The lending institution, a variety of institutions that are going to participate in this process, the lending institution will receive a tax credit which will cover what they would normally be charging in interest, and the Federal Government will be responsible for that tax credit.

This is a proposal that still has to pass. It has the support of the administration and in large part of the Congress, certainly the Democratic Members.

I hope that we can keep a focus on this common-sense agenda. It is a simple matter on the one hand; it does not take a Ph.D., a very high IQ, to under-

stand that we cannot improve education unless the place where the children come to learn is properly equipped, it is safe, conducive to learning, the laboratories have equipment for science courses that are held; there is a library. There are all kinds of things that need to happen.

We need to also consider educational technology, telecommunications equipment, computers and video equipment. All of that is not a luxury anymore. That should be integrated into the whole process of improving our instruction, and those are capital items that ought to be in the fiscal facilities' budgets. Let us keep the common sense on target.

Let us support the effort on April 8 and use it to further pressure our elected officials to move on school construction. They can move in New York City. They have more than \$1 billion surplus. They expect \$1 billion surplus from this year's budget. That surplus should be dedicated partially, certainly, to some aspect of school construction. Maybe New York can show that it cares about its children by first dedicating part of that available \$1 billion surplus to the elimination of coal-burning furnaces.

We have almost 300 schools that have coal-burning furnaces, and we could move to eliminate those coal-burning furnaces. Maybe on April 8 in New York City, we need to highlight this whole matter of the coal-burning furnaces as a way to get it started. New York State has more than \$2 billion in surplus, and that surplus, some part of that could be dedicated to the elimination of the coal-burning schools. There is no reason why the combination of the city surplus funds and State surpluses could not be used right away to eliminate the coal-burning furnaces.

We do not have to wait for the Federal Government, but I am grateful that the Federal Government, under the leadership of President Clinton, is going to remain on target. I hope that out of shame the localities like the State of New York and the City of New York, local governments and State governments all over the country will be shamed into getting out there and taking the lead before the Federal Government comes to our rescue, and I hope that the Federal Government's insistence that something must be done will certainly wake up the citizens to push and pressure and demand that we get some action on this matter of school construction.

□ 2100

School construction is at the heart of any improvement, but there are many other things that have to happen.

Tonight I do want to talk about some of the other things that must happen in order to really improve education in general and, specifically, education in the African American schools, schools where most of our African American students are educated.

They still are, by and large, segregated in big cities in the North and

far West. The patterns of housing are such and the dwindling commitment to integration is such that most of them are still going to school in segregated schools.

I do not plan to deal with the virtues of segregation versus the evils of segregation, or the virtues of integration versus the evils of integration. I do not care to deal with that tonight. I think that the fact is that the way things have developed, we have large numbers of African American youth in inner city schools, and those schools are in terrible shape.

I want to talk tonight from the base of a lecture that was given by an expert on this subject. I want to use excerpts from that lecture to pinpoint the kinds of things that are happening in African American education across the country.

I heard a presentation by the author of this lecture. I heard the presentation on February 25 at Howard University, where we had a breakfast forum sponsored by the National Commission for African American Education and CRESPAR. CRESPAR is a program funded to help students placed at risk by OERI, the Office of Education, Research and Improvement.

A combination of CRESPAR and the National Commission for African American Education sponsored this forum. This is the first of three forums. There is one each month; and one is going to be held on March 25, also at Howard University; and another will be held in April.

The subject was the state of African American education, and the presenter was Dr. Antoine M. Garibaldi, who is the provost of Howard University. Dr. Garibaldi had previously given a lecture, the annual Charles H. Thompson lecture, on November 5 of last year. This lecture was used as the basis of his excerpts and his summary presentation at the February 25 breakfast forum sponsored by the National Commission for African American Education and CRESPAR.

The contents here, what I am about to read some excerpts from, this total presentation will appear in the *Journal of Negro Education* in the spring of 1998. I do not know, they do not give the exact publication date, but the contents of this presentation will be there in full. The *Journal of Negro Education* will have this lecture entitled, "Four Decades of Progress and Decline: An Assessment of African American Educational Attainment." So I am going to read some excerpts from this presentation, which I think is a very good summary.

I also want to utilize the recently published test results from the New York City school system. The New York Times and the Daily News and some other papers carried the results of the reading and math tests for the elementary schools, and this past week they had the results from the middle schools and the high schools also. I have with me the results. I am going to

confine my remarks to the elementary schools and the test results and what that means.

I think New York City and the education system in New York City is an excellent place for case studies, or one big case study. We have a system with 1,100 schools and 1,100,000-plus students, more than 60,000 teachers. It is a fantastic laboratory for education. All kinds of things are going on there. It is a central-policy-making body, but it only makes general policy.

They have 32 community school boards, and they differ in the policy-making bodies that they have. Therefore, the policies and the emphases differ, even though they are under one basic chancellor and one board of education. These differences are very interesting to behold. There are patterns that apply throughout the city to communities that are similar in terms of income and demography, and there are patterns sometimes that are broken, suddenly.

When you see schools that break out of a pattern, it seems to me a good example to go study and find out why you have a high-performing school in an area of great poverty, when most of the schools in areas of great poverty in New York perform very poorly.

The results of the reading and math tests, the test scores, in summary say to me that we have a basket case of a system in many of our districts. Many of our district's education has almost ceased to take place. The scores are so low that you cannot say you are educating anyone. Too many of the districts have those kinds of reading and math scores.

I think that I could venture safely to say that the school system of New York City today, in 1998, is much worse than the school system of New York City was 10 years ago, in 1988. In 1998, it is much worse than it was in 1988. Ten years have been 10 years of decline.

One major reason for this, an obvious reason, is that we pulled the leadership out of our schools. Responding to budget emergencies in the school system, we encouraged the most knowledgeable people, the people with the most experience, to leave the system. To save money, we wrecked the system. No corporation when it downsizes is as foolish as the New York City school system was.

I will not say the school system was foolish. I do not think the teachers and administrators who made those decisions were foolish. It was the city hall and the budget crisis that motivated and pressured the system into taking these tremendous cuts by encouraging the most experienced staff to leave because they had the highest salaries. They had advanced up the ladder and those were the highest salaries.

You can save a lot of money if you get rid of high-salary people and you bring in brand-new people to start at entry level. The problem with people starting at entry level, they have no experience as to how to run schools, as

to how to teach. They need people with experience on top.

That one action, which was really driven by budget considerations, it was the wrong decision. They should have done something else, somewhere else in the budget. The last thing that should have been done was to encourage the leadership to leave the schools.

So we have schools that were not good 10 years ago that are far worse now as a result of many forces, but the major factor is the fact that they pulled out the leadership. They pulled out the best teachers and the best administrators.

We cannot blame this on the top administrator, because we have had three or four top administrators in the position of chancellor in the last 10 years. The present one has been there 2 years, and we cannot really hold him accountable for what has happened. A chancellor in New York City would have to be around for 5 to 10 years before we could really hold him accountable. I hope we can maintain some kind of continuity and the present chancellor will be around long enough to see if that leadership has some continuity and will be able to stabilize the system and stop it from going down more rapidly and also to improve the system.

I also want to speak about some observations that I have in the pending markup of the Higher Education Assistance Act tomorrow. I want to talk about the impact of higher education and what is happening in our colleges, on what is happening in our African American elementary and secondary schools.

I am talking about the state of emergency in African American education. The emergency goes right through with higher education. The number of students in higher education is nothing to brag about. We have an increase, and I am going to talk about that number of African American students in higher education, the number who have graduated, the number getting masters' degrees and Ph.D.s. Those are increasing, but far too slowly.

The number who are going into teaching, who come out of college, is decreasing. The number of African Americans who go into teaching and the percentage of African American teachers in the schools where the greatest number of African American students attend has declined over the years. It has gone down. That is part of the problem.

I want to make some observations about the fact that we are considering the reauthorization of the Higher Education Assistance Act in a markup tomorrow in the Committee on Education and the Workforce. The Committee on Education and the Workforce will be considering this piece of legislation, which is only reauthorized once every 5 years, so it is a critical piece of legislation.

As we go into the 21st century we are making a statement about the role of the Federal Government in higher education. I am not pleased with the kind

of openness of this discussion up to now. I am not pleased with the breadth of the inclusiveness of this discussion.

I have been here in Congress, this is my 16th year. I have gone through two reauthorizations of the Higher Education Assistance Act, and the other two were under our former colleague from Michigan, Representative Bill Ford, who later became the chairman of the Committee on Education and Labor, and Bill Ford was noted for his inclusiveness in the decision-making.

The way he approached the reauthorization was a whole year in advance he began the process. He started the process by sending out the old bill, the existing law, and asking for comments on existing law. A widespread request went out to all the people in the higher education community, asking them to give us their input as to how they would like the existing law changed. He started this process a whole year in advance of the markups.

We had a process where people were involved. We had hearings at the regional level. We had hearings in Washington. We had all kinds of discussions going on in the higher education community, and when we finally came to the process of markup, there was a thorough understanding of what the issues were, a thorough understanding of what was being proposed.

Then the markups went on sometimes for quite a long time. The higher education markup never concluded in one day. It is too great a burden to bear to rush through this process, and I hope we do not rush through it tomorrow.

I think as we approach the year 2000, given the fact that the country now is enjoying one of the greatest eras of prosperity that we have known in this century, given the fact that we do not have to worry about deficits anymore, given the fact that there is no Cold War, given the fact that there are places where there are large numbers of vacancies, job vacancies, especially in the telecommunications and information technology area.

The information and technology area requires higher education beyond high school, generally; and there are a great number of vacancies. They estimate there are as many as 300,000 vacancies. I get a different number every day, but it keeps climbing. There are 300,000 vacancies now, and the projection is that this is going to go on for the next 10 years.

We are going to need more and more people who are trained and well-educated with respect to information technology. We are going to need people who are not so well-trained. For every genius, we are going to need some assistance. For the designers for web sites and computer systems and software, we are going to need their helpers.

We are going to need technologists, mechanics, aides in the schools. We are going to need a whole bevy of people to make educational technology work. If

you saddle a teacher with the burden of having to take care of her own educational technology program with no help, the likelihood is they are going to be overwhelmed. So they need technologists in the schools. They need aides in the schools. They are going to need all kinds of people.

I do not think that they have taken into consideration all of the places we are going to need technology workers. It is one item that should be considered as we consider a Higher Education Assistance Act. I will be offering an amendment tomorrow which deals with this.

Finally, I want to end my comments on the continuing state of emergency in African American education by discussing a situation in New York City at another level. We had a problem with our elementary and secondary schools. We now have a problem with our higher education institutions.

The City of New York, CUNY, the City of New York University system, the CUNY system has more than 200,000 students. There are all kinds of junior colleges, senior colleges. It is a huge enterprise; and a large number of the colleges, community colleges and senior colleges, have remedial education programs.

For some reason, the mayor and the Board of Higher Education has declared war on remedial education. Suddenly, remedial education is being treated with great contempt. They have remedial education courses all over the country. I do not know why suddenly in New York remedial education programs are being treated with such great contempt. It is a great mistake.

There is a crusade against remedial education, blindly lashing out and saying it does not belong in the schools and threatening to extract them and put them at the institutes. There is a whole lot of heat being generated about something without very much light. I am going to talk about that as part of my total discussion on the continuing state of emergency in African American education.

I am pleased to see that I have been joined by my colleague, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD), who I yield to for a statement.

□ 2115

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. I thank the gentleman so much. When I heard the gentleman speak about the emergency state that our education system is in, I had no other recourse but to come to this floor. Let me first thank the gentleman for his unwavering, tireless efforts on behalf of the children of this country because he comes to this floor every night to talk about the conditions of education in this country and until we do something about that, I am sure he is going to continue to come and he is going to pull some of us out. Because we recognize what the state of emergency the education system is in, as I serve on

the National Commission on Teaching and America's Future, I was pleased to hear the President's education initiative that he brought on the night of the State of the Union. And there are two very key components of that education initiative. One is the 100,000 new qualified teachers. We must have qualified teachers to teach our students if they are to engage in this global work force beyond the year 2000.

The second part of that initiative is school construction. We can ill afford to talk about the infrastructure of our roads and bridges and not talk about the infrastructure of our schools. You are absolutely right. They are delapidated. They are the worst things that we can provide for our children when we talk about environments that are conducive to learning.

I have gone to a lot of schools, the majority of the schools in my district, but a lot of other schools across this Nation. It is absolutely deplorable that we want to talk about educating our children when we do not put our money where our mouths are in, putting up the funds for the school construction to build the infrastructure for educating our children. It is absolutely unconscionable that we sit in this House and those on the other side of the aisle speak about education and speak about productivity when it comes to businesses but they do not see that it starts in the classrooms. When children have to run for cover when it rains because of leaky roofs, when they are sitting in classrooms and the plaster falls from the walls and from the top of the classroom and they have to run, that is lost productivity in a sense because they are not being trained. Therefore, they are not learning and it impedes those students.

So what you are talking about is absolutely the number one issue in this country. If we are going to talk about education and the quality of education, we must first put our children in classrooms and facilities that are conducive to learning.

I brought some statistics along and I want you to just hear me out here for a second. One-third of all elementary and secondary schools in the United States serving 14 million students need extensive repair or renovation. Now this is what we are talking about.

Mr. OWENS. I am pleased that the gentlewoman has brought these statistics. You are talking about all students. We are talking about the mainstream. I am going to focus on just the African American community, but it is bad in many other places outside the African American community, suburbs and rural as well as in the inner cities.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. Absolutely. I come from inner city so I am talking about the schools in the Los Angeles Unified School District, in the Compton School District, in the Long Beach School District. These are urban school districts that I am talking about, with the majority minority students. As we look at the work force in

the year 2000 and beyond, it will be a majority minority. But we cannot educate kids in these dilapidated schools. That is what we are talking about.

Minority students, African American students, Latinos, Asians and others, they will not be able to move into the 21st century because they will be behind having been impeded by the lack of infrastructure in these schools.

Let me give you some more statistics. Over 60 percent of the Nation's 100,000 public and elementary school facilities need major repair. We are talking about schools across the strata but we are really talking about a lot of the urban schools because that is where the parents are not able to put money into the schools to help, whereas in suburban schools, some suburban schools and some is rural schools. Rural schools and urban schools are pretty much in the same boat. They, too, are witnessing a decline in school facilities that will not be conducive for children and their learning. In 1996, an estimated \$112 billion was needed to repair and upgrade school facilities into a good condition, not excellent condition, which means that the child might come in and something, plaster might fall on them. So when you talk about our African American children, you are talking about schools that are absolutely dilapidated and we should feel badly, we should really feel, talking about feeling ungodly, we should when we ask kids to go to these types of schools to learn. We do not come to this House where the roof is leaking and the plaster is falling. Why should we ask the 50 something million children in this country to be put in that type of environment.

So I am happy tonight that you have come to talk about that and to talk about all of the things that are impeding the quality education, public education that is sorely needed in this country. Public education must be the tool that helps African American children, other minority children to get the head start that they need if we are going to cross this bridge into the 21st century with students and ultimately workers to be prepared for this global work force.

I will defer to the gentleman.

Mr. OWENS. I think you have said public education. I just wanted to make a note here that large numbers of parents in the African American community, when they are interviewed for polls have been indicating that they want to send their children to private schools. The majority party, the Republicans are offering vouchers and scholarships, et cetera, to go to private schools as an answer, a solution to this problem. However, I have no problem with parents who want to send their children to private school if they can get them in. We have the mayor of New York with a scholarship program which provides spaces in private schools for 1000 youngsters. There are 1,120,000 plus youngsters who go to school in New York. So when they put out the indica-

tion that they want applications for the 1000 places, they got 22,000 applications, 22,000 applications for 1000 places. Here in Washington I understand they had a situation where they put out the same thing. There is a scholarship fund that has been set up by the private sector and they got 7000 applications for 1000 different places. Suppose they had more money and could give more tuition scholarships, how many private schools are there that can absorb the youngsters who are attending our public schools? How many are there and how quickly will they run out of space? Many of them have waiting lists for people who can afford to pay. They do not have room for them, let alone people who are coming in on the scholarship basis. So most of our children are going to be educated in public schools. I am all in favor of charter schools and experimenting with charter schools, but the reality is that in the next 10 years most of the children of America, certainly 95 percent of the children who live in the inner city who are African American are going to be educated in public schools. We have to improve public schools. That is the only real solution that is going to help African American students and parents.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. And the one real solution to keep America strong, we must invest in public education. Vouchers are not the answer. I can tell you that unequivocally, because when you give the vouchers, you are only giving X amount of dollars, supposedly, for the tuitional fee or tuitional cost of the student going to a private school. But you do not take into consideration the transportation that the parent has to provide for that student to go over there. If that student gets ill, the means by which or the inability of parents to go, to find their way to the school to take the child to what we perceive now, not really any health care facilities at all. The kids are not networking in the community of which they live. As a former educator, I will say to you, I fought the voucher in California and will fight it again because vouchers are not the answer. I am for charter schools, for those experimental types of schools that will allow the local control to be in control of their schools and that is because parents are involved in that process. That is why I am open to that concept. But never to the one that suggests that vouchers will be the answer when vouchers have not and will not be the answer to quality education for students. You are taking them out of their neighborhood environments. You are putting them oftentimes in environments that are more hostile because they do not know anyone and it becomes an isolated environment and then the parents are ill prepared to go and get the child if the child is sick. And so the voucher system is not a system that will work. I submit to you that a lot of our Presidents went to public schools, finished public schools.

Mr. OWENS. We share the same sentiments, but I think you are aware of what is taking place in the African American community, that there are large numbers of parents who have given up on the system and they want, they say they want vouchers. The polls show this. What is happening is our Republican colleagues, by the way, they know that in their districts their constituents do not want vouchers. Their constituents want continued improvement in public schools and they think they have good public schools so their own constituencies are not interested in vouchers. They are going to go out and advocate for the African American parents that they should have vouchers and they are using them as guinea pigs, they are whipping up all of these false promises about what vouchers may produce. And as I pointed out before, when you come to the point where you have the places in the private schools that are all too few and nevertheless they keep pushing the idea that vouchers are the answers to school improvement in America. It is a dogma. They seem blind to the reality and to reason. They go right ahead. But they are parading, there are parading African American parents out to support that argument. Our first duty is to get to the African American parents and leaders, and it is hard to tell them not to give up on the public school system because they have gone through so much and, as I said before, New York, things are getting worse in the public school system. But we have no choice. We have to drive it home. We have no choice. Most of our children are going to be educated in the public school system. We must improve the public education.

Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD. Absolutely. I am a product of the private schools, but my father paid for the tuition, not, he did not strip public education funds for me to go to a private school. And so I submit to you for parents who want to pay for the private tuition, so be it. But we can ill afford to have anyone in this body strip the funds from public education to trick parents into going to schools whereby the parents will not be able to continue, first of all, the tuition fee. Tuition fee as we looked at this a couple of years ago when we had that as a proposition on the California ballot was beyond the amounts of money that the voucher system would entitle them to have. So consequently, they would not have enough money to even pay for the tuition, let alone the transportation and all other factors that are embedded in this whole notion of transferring kids from public schools to private schools. I will say to you that I am not for that, but a lot of my parents are not for that; they are African American parents. Maybe it is because we have drilled them quite a bit. We have had sessions with them, and they do understand the ramifications of the issue if in fact they would choose to do that. And they do not choose to have a voucher system.

Mr. OWENS. Maybe it is because they have excellent leadership in an educator like you. They understand better.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. We are trying to educate the masses because I think it is important that we do that. I think we as CBC Members should really do the network and the cross to the school board Members and others to educate our constituencies to let them know that stop before you pick up the wrong plum because that might not be the plum, that might be the plum with the worm in it.

□ 2130

We must be careful of folks coming in sheep clothing because it may not be the right thing that is applicable to our child getting a quality education.

I think we can do that. We can do that and should do that expeditiously so that we can provide the type of leadership that African Americans and other minorities need when it comes to this voucher program. We must just turn off from that and start looking at the number of children who must be educated by public schools and get the type of school facilities that will be conducive to these kids and a quality education.

I am just appalled at us still hammering out and staying on this one issue of vouchers and not looking at the crumbling schools, the inferior types of classrooms and schoolhouses that we are asking our children to go to, and yet we are talking about the 21st century and this global work force.

This is why businesspeople are coming now to me asking what can they do to help create the climate in public schools whereby our children can learn and have a quality education. And that is the road that I am going to journey, not this other road.

Mr. OWENS. I think the gentleman might be aware, because, after all, she is from California, and that is where Silicon Valley is, she must be aware of this tremendous shortage of information technology workers. And she has probably heard we are going to have on this floor a proposal to amend the immigration bill by the people who were so harsh on immigrants and wanted to keep out immigrants. They are now going to have proposals here asking us to amend it, to bring in more immigrants who have high-technology experience, information technology workers.

They are going to try to solve the problem of the shortage of information technology workers not by increasing the educational opportunities for the people in this country, they are going to bring in immigrants to do that. These anti-immigrant Republicans are going to be leading the fight to get more people in here to take those jobs instead of educating people here already to enable them to qualify for the jobs.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. The gentleman is absolutely right, I have

heard of that. I think again it is unconscionable that we are talking about bringing folks into a country that has so much to offer and a people who are thirsty for this type of education that we cannot educate our own to provide them the jobs that will be sorely need in the Silicon Valley to all other places where high tech is booming.

So I submit to the gentleman that I hope that we come to our senses before this bill comes and goes off of this floor. What type of message are we sending to our students? I have a science academy with very bright kids coming from low-income families. It is not the top 1, 2 and 5 percent, it is the middle level who are very sharp kids who are going to this academy. They are looking for these jobs in the future. What am I to tell them when they are making the A's and B's and wanting to go to MIT and others; that I am sorry someone from overseas might come and take their jobs?

I cannot do that, and, therefore, I will be fighting against that bill.

Mr. OWENS. Well, I think we are going to have that opportunity. I thank the gentlewoman for her comments.

Ms. MILLENDER-McDONALD. We thank the gentleman so much for this tonight. I am happy to have had an opportunity to come and share with him my feelings. Again, I thank him so much for being just absolutely a stalwart person in bringing this education issue to the people across this Nation so that they can write us and let us know that they agree with us. They applaud what the gentleman is doing, and I hope he will continue his great work for all our children.

One-third of all elementary and secondary schools in the United States, serving 14 million students, need extensive repair or renovation.

Over 60 percent of the Nation's 110,000 public elementary and secondary school facilities need major repair.

In 1996, an estimated \$112 billion was needed to repair and upgrade school facilities to a "good" condition.

Many schools do not have the physical infrastructure to take advantage of computers and other technology needed to meet the challenges of the next century.

I am a former school teacher for the Los Angeles Unified School District in California.

In California, 87 percent of the schools report a need to upgrade or repair on-site buildings to good overall condition.

Seventy-one percent of all California schools have at least one inadequate building feature, and of these building feature problems: 40 percent are the roofs; 42 percent are exterior walls and windows; 41 percent are plumbing; 41 percent are heating, ventilation, and air conditioning; and 37 percent of schools do not even have sufficient capability to use computers.

Currently, 25 percent of schools are too small or overcrowded and the Department of Education predicts that the Nation will need 6,000 more schools by the year 2006.

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman. I think most people

understand that I am not a fanatic. I am not an extremist. I am not coming repeatedly talking about the same subject because I have some kind of mental infirmity. I just think that our children, our grandchildren will be very disappointed in us if we do not take advantage of this opportunity we have at this moment in American history.

We have no evil empire to fight. We have the highest prosperity levels that we have had in this century. If we do not invest in education now, when will we do it? Are we going to let these opportunities that are opening up go by without making an effort to have a match between the opportunities and the youngsters who are in this country right now?

I am going to hasten on, and instead of doing the entire set of excerpts that I was going to do from Mr. Garibaldi's presentation, I am going to just read his abstract and go on to the other points I want to make.

As I said before, this is a presentation to deal with the "State of African American Education." I am reading from Dr. Antoine M. Garibaldi, Provost, Howard University, who gave this lecture on November 5th, 1997, at the 18th annual Charles H. Thompson lecture, and it is going to be published in the Journal of Negro Education. I heard him give his summary comments at a breakfast forum sponsored by the National Commission for African American Education at Howard University.

To quote from Mr. Garibaldi, "Even though significant progress has been made in attendance and degree attainment in elementary and secondary schools, college, graduate and professional schools, data shows that there has also been a pattern of regression with respect to African Americans' educational attainment and achievement over the last four decades. This mixed assessment, however, must be placed in an appropriate context and be used to improve further those conditions that are impairing the performance of African American students."

"Additionally, the presentation will highlight positive trends such as high graduation rates from high school, improved performance on selected tests on educational measures, successful school programs, successful students, the continued contributions of historically black colleges and universities to baccalaureate, graduate and first professional degree production, and to the preparation of African American teachers, to name just a few."

"Specific recommendations are also offered to raise the level of student performance, i.e. more rigorous curricula, higher educational standards and higher expectations for students, higher expectations by teachers, increased involvement by parents and the vigorous support of communities and non-profit organizations."

"Many challenging issues and questions are also cited to demonstrate

that serious work is needed to reduce the many inequities that still exist in the schools attended by African American students."

Now, Mr. Garibaldi is an ex-professor. He was a professor at Xavier University at one time. He has been in the field for a long time, and he has accumulated quite a bit of firsthand experience, but he also uses very good sources, as he demonstrates in this presentation, in his thorough knowledge of the state of African American education.

I am going to ask a lot of this be introduced into the RECORD without my reading it all, because the time is going rapidly. But I do want to begin by just pointing out that under elementary and secondary educational attainment, Mr. Garibaldi notes the following: "Over the last four decades, African Americans have made tremendous gains in elementary and secondary educational attainment, and significant increases in high school completion rates began in the 1970s. In 1975, high school completion rate for 18- to 24-year-old African Americans was only 64.8 percent compared to 83 percent for whites and 80.8 percent overall. In 1995, however, 18- to 24-year-old African Americans' high school completion rate was 76.9 percent, which was a 12 percent increase over the 20-year period. But the high school graduation data for African Americans are even better for 25- to 29-year-olds between 1975 and 1995; in 1975, 71 percent graduated from high school compared to 86.5 percent in 1995."

He goes on in a later passage to say, "While African Americans' high school completion rates provide one barometer of educational attainment, performance on national assessments are needed to determine how much learning has been actually achieved. Thus, the best collection of national comparative data is the National Assessment of Educational Progress, NAEP, a congressionally-mandated project of the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics. Since 1969, NAEP has periodically assessed students' proficiency in academic achievements in science, reading, mathematics and writing in public and nonpublic schools, with the specific purpose of evaluating the condition and progress of education in the Nation."

He goes on to talk about performances in mathematics and reading and writing of African American students and students overall, showing that there have been some impressive gains by African American students, but they still fall far short, especially when we come to the SAT scores over the years. There is still a great gap between the achievements of white students and African American students who take the SAT test.

There is a section which I think is important to bring to my colleagues' attention in this presentation which talks about the impact of poverty on

urban schools: "Earlier in this article great concern was expressed about the increasing segregation of many of the Nation's public schools. Of special significance here is the fact that most of the schools attended by nonwhite youth are located in urban areas. While this has been known for some time, numerous perceptions about the quality of these schools are fueled by unsubstantiated anecdotal comments. But a July 1996 report by the U.S. Department of Education on how poverty relates to the characteristics of students in urban, rural and suburban schools in the 1980s has made several notable comparisons in describing the students' school experiences, their school achievement, the expectations of their parents and other related factors.

"In this study, which is entitled *Urban Schools, The Challenge of Location and Poverty*, the methodology controlled for the extent of poverty and three types of school locations. The school locations that were examined included urban, suburban and rural areas, and the level of poverty in each school was defined by the percentage of students who received free or reduced-priced lunches. Thus, more balanced comparisons were able to be made on each factor even though more low-income students attended urban schools.

"The following highlights of the study's major findings show more clearly how factors of school location and the level of poverty in those schools directly and indirectly affect school performance. Urban, suburban and rural public schools with high poverty concentrations, 40 percent or more, were more likely to have larger minority student populations than schools with low levels of poverty. Additionally, urban public schools with higher concentrations of poverty enrolled larger numbers of minority students than high-poverty rural and suburban schools.

"Sixty-nine percent of students who attended high-poverty urban public schools, for example, were minorities, compared to enrollment of 26 percent minorities at low-poverty schools. Similarly, at suburban schools, 56 percent of the students in high-poverty schools were minorities, but only 10 percent of students at low-poverty suburban schools are minorities. Additionally, high-poverty rural public schools enrolled 35 percent minority students compared to only 9 percent at low-poverty schools.

"Thus, most African Americans and other minority students not only attend urban schools, but the schools also have the highest concentrations of students from families with low economic backgrounds."

In other words, to summarize, no matter where African American students go to school, they are usually attending schools with a large poverty population. There is a correlation. The percentage of African Americans who are poor is quite great. It is much

greater than the percentage of the overall population who are poor.

I am not going to read any further, but I do want to submit for the RECORD additional pages from this lecture, which is entitled *Four Decades of Progress and Decline in the Assessment of African American Educational Attainment*.

In the section that I just read, they mentioned poverty as a correlation with low achievement. I want to take a few minutes to talk about the scores of the students in the public schools of New York City, the elementary schools. There was a report, as I said before, in all the newspapers. The New York Times did something which was unusual. They took the poverty level of the school in the same manner in which the study that was cited here in Mr. Garibaldi's presentation. They chose the number of students who received school lunches as an indicator of the poverty of the school.

Therefore, the prosperity of the school is indicated by just the reverse, the number who do not qualify indicate the income level. They chose that figure, and in their presentation of the results of the reading and math tests for New York City Schools, they added the income for each school, the income level, meaning the number of students who do not qualify for school lunches.

If the income was 2.5, that meant that all of the other students did qualify; 97.5 percent qualified for school lunches.

□ 2145

So the income level after 2.5 means that 97 percent of the students were poor, and in certain districts you have this tremendous concentration of poverty.

The New York Times also went one step further and they chose to measure the performance of schools with a certain poverty level in New York City with schools who would have the same poverty level than the rest of the State, the same income level, not just poverty but those with high income were measured, too; and they have put another column in here called Reading Performance. And just certain quick observations.

One of the highest income areas in the city, Staten Island, happened to be one the lowest performing areas. When you compare the performance of the students in Staten Island, which has an overall level of 58.9 million, meaning 58.9 percent of all of the students in Staten Island have incomes which disqualify them for school lunch programs, many of the schools have income levels which rate as high as 84 and 85 percent, I think 86 percent, very high income levels; and, nevertheless, it was one of the areas that scored lowest when you compared the performance of the students in those schools with the performance of students at the same income level in other parts of the State.

So Staten Island I might note, as I have before, has a serious problem. And

this barometer is a very interesting one that brings out the fact that we may have some serious problems in the way administrators and teachers and the system is conducting itself beyond poverty.

However, poverty is still the major problem in the majority of the districts in New York City. The correlation between the reading scores and poverty is there in school after school except, in every district, one or two schools, despite the low poverty level, they stand out as having extraordinary performance. Which means that despite the fact that there is a close correlation between poverty and low performance, it can be overcome. And it is important that an attempt be made to overcome it and pinpoint at the schools that are performing well, we should pinpoint what factors allow them to overcome the poverty.

I am going to just deal with District 23, which is one of the school districts. We have 32 districts in New York. District 23 is located in Brownsville, a large concentration of low-income housing projects. The overall income level in District 23 is the lowest in the City, just about, 8.3. Only 8.3 of the students have incomes so high that they do not qualify for school lunch programs. That means that 91 percent of the students are poor, they qualify for the school lunches, and a great deal would have to be done to overcome that.

Finally, I am running out of time so I want to mention that, in dealing with the problems faced by areas like Brownsville District 23, we are going to need teachers in large quantities. We are going to have to do something unusual. The Higher Education Assistance Act that we are discussing tomorrow needs to focus on teacher training and ways to deal with that problem, just as it needs to focus on information technology workers.

We have a TRIO program which has been over the years a program that works very well. The TRIO program produces students from low-income areas who were able to qualify for college admission, and they have a record of outstanding achievement. We need to look at the TRIO program in terms of the authorization level. We need to double, go so far as to double the authorization. Because from one end of the spectrum to the other, both sides of the aisle agree that the TRIO program, which consists of upward-bound programs, talent search programs, and some others, they work. If they work, we need to consider doubling the amount of appropriations and doubling the size of those programs in order to deal with the problem of poverty and the poverty relation to education if we are going to get students come out of the poverty areas and able to go to college and qualify to get the jobs that are available.

Finally, we certainly do not want a crusade against remedial education in our colleges in New York. Education

adds value to everybody who gets it, and remedial education as a part of the process will add value to the people who are in our City and enable them to go on to qualify for some of the jobs that are available and become productive in our society, thus lessening the kind of expenditure you have to make to support them.

Mr. Speaker, I insert the following for the RECORD:

[Pre-publication manuscript to be published in the Journal of Negro Education, Spring 1998]

(Antoine M. Garibaldi, Ph.D., Howard University)

THE STATE OF AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION—A PRESENTATION TO THE NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN EDUCATION

(By Antoine M. Garibaldi, Ph.D., Howard University)

ABSTRACT

This presentation¹ is based on an assessment of African American educational attainment—from the elementary grades to first-professional degrees—over the last four decades. Even though significant progress has been made in attendance and degree attainment in elementary and secondary schools, college, graduate and professional schools, data show that there has also been a pattern of regression with respect to African Americans' educational attainment and achievement over the last four decades. This mixed assessment, however, must be placed in an appropriate context and be used to improve further those conditions that are impairing the performance of African American students. Additionally, the presentation will highlight positive trends such as higher graduation rates from high school, improved performance on selected tests and educational measures, successful school programs, successful students, the continued contributions of Historically Black Colleges and Universities to baccalaureate, graduate, and first-professional degree production, and to the preparation of African American teachers, to name just a few. Specific recommendations are also offered to raise the level of student performance, i.e., more rigorous curricula, higher educational standards and expectations for students, higher expectations by teachers, increased involvement by parents, and the vigorous support of communities and non-profit organizations. Many challenging issues and questions are also cited to demonstrate that serious work is needed to reduce the many inequities that still exist in the schools attended by African American students.

These "re-segregated" enrollments have not occurred by accident; rather, they are partly the result of the out-migration of whites from urban to suburban school districts and the ineffective implementation of court orders designed to increase school integration in the late 1960's and 1970's. In spite of the 1954 Brown decision, it is disconcerting to realize that in 1997 many of the schools attended by African Americans are still "inherently unequal."

ELEMENTARY AND SECONDARY EDUCATIONAL ATTAINMENT

Over the last four decades, African Americans have made tremendous gains in elementary and secondary educational attainment; and significant increases in high school completion rates began in the 1970's. In 1975, the high school completion rate for 18- to 24-year old African Americans was only 64.8 percent,

compared to 83 percent for whites and 80.8 percent overall. In 1995, however, 18- to 24-year old African Americans' high school completion rate was 76.9 percent, a 12 percent increase over the twenty year period.

TABLE 3—HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION RATES FOR 18- TO 24-YEAR-OLDS: 1975 AND 1995

Year	African-Americans	Whites	Overall
1975	64.8%	83%	80.8%
1995	76.9%	81.9%	80.8%

Source: Carter, D.J. and Wilson, R. (1997). Minorities in Higher Education: Fifteenth Annual Status Report, 1996-97. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

But the high school graduation data for African Americans are even better for 25 to 29-year olds between 1975 and 1995: in 1975, 71 percent had graduated from high school, compared to 86.5% in 1995 (Carter and Wilson, 1997).

TABLE 4—HIGH SCHOOL COMPLETION RATES FOR 25- TO 29-YEAR-OLDS: 1975 AND 1995

Year	African-Americans	Whites
1975	71%	84.4%
1995	86.5%	87.4%

Source: Carter, D.J. and Wilson, R. (1997). Minorities in Higher Education: Fifteenth Annual Status Report, 1996-1997. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Not only are these gains remarkable, but the data also confirm that more African Americans have obtained an education over the last three decades as a result of expanded educational opportunities and a variety of special programs (such as Head Start, Title I/Chapter 1, etc.) for African American and other disadvantaged students.

While African Americans' high school completion rates provide one barometer of educational attainment, performance on national assessments are needed to determine how much learning has actually been achieved. Thus, the best collection of national comparative data is the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP)—a congressionally mandated project of the U.S. Department of Education's National Center for Education Statistics. Since 1969, NAEP has periodically assessed students' proficiency and academic achievement in science, reading, mathematics, and writing in public and nonpublic schools, with the specific purpose of evaluating the condition and progress of education in the nation. This national database assesses student performance in reading, mathematics and the sciences at 9, 13 and 17 years of age, and in grades 4, 8, and 11 for the writing assessment. More recent assessments since 1990, however, use grades 4, 8, and 11 as the baseline of comparison. Before presenting the twenty-eight year trend data for African American and white students, it is useful to cite NAEP's recently released summary statement of all students' overall performance since the tests were first administered in 1969.

"In general, the trends in science and mathematics show early declines or relative stability followed by improved performance. In reading and writing, the results are somewhat mixed; although some modest improvement was evident in the trend reading assessments, few indications of positive trends were evident in the writing results" (Campbell, Voelkl, & Donahue, 1997).

TRENDS IN NAEP MATHEMATICS SCALE SCORES: 1973-1996

On the NAEP mathematics test, 17-year old white and black students had declining scores between 1973 and 1978, but both increased their performance between 1978 and 1996, with black students showing the most

¹Footnotes at end of article.

growth. The mathematics scores of white and black 9- and 13-year old students also consistently increased throughout the assessment period. However, while black and white students' mathematics scores increased between 1973 and 1996, the scores of white students were at least 25 points higher than their black counterparts in each age group.

TRENDS IN NAEP READING SCALE SCORES: 1971-1996

The NAEP reading scores for each of the three age groups of white students increased slightly during the 1971-1996 assessment period. African Americans' scores also increased between 1971 and 1988, but fluctuated between 1988 and 1996. Thus, while both groups' performance showed modest improvement on this key educational measure, white students' scores averaged 30 points higher than those of their black counterparts in each age group.

TRENDS IN NAEP WRITING SCALE SCORES: 1984-1996

On the NAEP writing tests between 1984 and 1996, both white and black students performed poorly. The scores of white students who were in the 11th-grade decreased consistently over the assessment period; and eighth-grade and fourth-grade white students' scores fluctuated over the twelve year period. Black students' writing scores also fluctuated at all grade levels. Fourth-grade black students' 1984 score was identical to the 1996 score, while both 8th and 11th-grade black students' 1996 score was slightly lower than their 1984 score. White 11th-grade and 8th-grade students and black 11th-grade students demonstrated an ability to write clearly. But black 8th-grade students and white 4th-grade students demonstrated vague and unclear writing skills. As was the case in the previous assessments, white students' average scores in writing were at least 22 points higher than their black counterparts in each age group.

TRENDS IN NAEP SCIENCE SCALE SCORES: 1969-1970

The average NAEP science test scores for 17-year old black and white students decreased from 1969 to 1982, but steadily increased from 1982 through 1996. The scores for white 9- and 13-year old students decreased slightly from 1969 to 1977, but increased moderately from 1977 through 1996. African American students' scores for this group also declined during the early 1970's, but increased noticeably through 1996. Even though the scores of African American 9- and 13-year old students increased more over the duration of the assessment period, the scores were not higher than that of their white counterparts in 1996. Between 1969 and 1996, the average score of white students was 47 points higher than that of black students.

1997 ACT/SAT PERFORMANCE

The preceding NAEP data indicate that there have been both trends of progress and decline in all American students' performance in the four core subject areas of reading, math, science and writing. And those less than proficient signs of performance are unfortunately, but expectedly, reflected on other national educational measures, such as the verbal and mathematical scales of the College Board's Scholastic Achievement Test, and on the English, mathematics, reading, and science reasoning sections of the ACT, Inc.'s American College Test. In 1997, for example, the average SAT score of all students was 1016 on a total scale of 1600. Asian American students obtained the highest average score of 1056; White students were next with a score of 1052; American Indian students had an average score of 950; Hispanic students had a score of 934, followed

by Mexican Americans with 909, and Puerto Rican students with an average score of 901. African American students had the lowest average score of 857.

Table 5—1997 Average SAT Test Scores

Asian-American students	1056
White students	1052
National average	1016
Hispanic students	934
African-American students	857

Source: The College Board, 1997.

The patterns of performance were similar on the ACT: average overall performance was 21.0 (out of a total score of 36); Asian American and White students had the same average score of 21.7; American Indian and Hispanic students had scores of 19; Mexican American students scored 18.8; and African American students had the lowest average score of 17.1 (Selingo and Fiore, 1997).

Table 6—1997 Average ACT Test Scores

Asian-American students	21.7
White students	21.7
National average	21
Hispanic students	19
African-American students	17.1

Source: ACT, Inc. 1997.

While one of the signs of progress with respect to these tests is that there have been increasingly more test-takers, especially among minority groups² staff from both organizations that develop and administer these tests have expressed their concern about the lower standardized test performance of students who cite that they have high grades in high school. To this issue, Donald M. Stewart, President of the College Board, has emphatically stated that:

"Educators who give high grades for average or below-average performance promote a hollow, 'just good enough' attitude that is detrimental to students and society" (Selingo and Fiore, 1997).

Grade inflation and social promotion are unconscionable practices that should be eliminated at every school site to assure that students have a realistic assessment of both their abilities and performance. Additionally, schools must assume more responsibility and require students to take more academic and college-bound courses in junior and senior high schools. The latter recommendation is a necessity for schools with large numbers of African American and other non-white students given the evidence which shows that many of these students are more likely to take lower level courses in the core subject areas (i.e., English, Mathematics, Sciences, etc.) rather than college prep courses (Braddock, 1990; Oakes, 1985, 1986; Irvine, 1990).

THE IMPACT OF POVERTY ON URBAN SCHOOLS

Earlier in this article, great concern was expressed about the increasing segregation of many of the nation's public schools. Of special significance here is the fact that most of the schools attended by non-white youth are located in urban areas. While this has been known for some time, numerous perceptions about the quality of these schools are fueled by unsubstantiated anecdotal comments. But a July 1996 report by the U.S. Department of Education on how poverty relates to the characteristics of students in urban, rural and suburban schools in the 1980's has made several notable comparisons in describing the students' school experiences, their school achievement, the expectations of their parents, and other related factors. In this study, Urban Schools: The challenge of location and poverty (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1996), the methodology controlled for the extent of poverty in the three types of school locations. The school locations that were examined included urban, suburban and rural areas, and the level of

poverty in each school was defined by the percentage of students who received free or reduced price lunches. Thus, more balanced comparisons were able to be made on each factor even though more low income students attended urban schools. The following highlights of the study's major findings show more clearly how factors of school location and the level of poverty in those schools directly and indirectly affect school performance.

RACE, POVERTY LEVELS AND SCHOOL LOCATIONS

Urban, suburban and rural public schools with high poverty concentrations (i.e., 40 percent or more) we more likely to have larger minority student populations than schools with low levels of poverty (i.e., 5 percent or less).³ Additionally, urban public schools with high concentrations of poverty enrolled larger numbers of minority students than high poverty rural and suburban schools. Sixty nine percent of students who attended high poverty urban public schools, for example, were minorities, compared to enrollments of 26 percent minorities at low poverty schools. Similarly, at suburban schools, 56 percent of the students at high poverty schools were minorities; but only 10 percent of students at low poverty suburban schools were minorities. Additionally, high poverty rural public schools enrolled 35 percent minority students compared to only 9 percent at low poverty schools (U.S. Dept. of Education, 1996). Thus, more African American and other minority students not only attend urban schools, but the schools also have the highest concentrations of students from families with low economic backgrounds.

STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT, POVERTY LEVELS AND SCHOOL LOCATIONS

The level of poverty at schools was an important variable when examining students' academic achievement. Students who had the lowest levels of achievement on standardized tests were more often enrolled at high poverty public schools, while students who performed at higher achievement levels attended schools with lower levels of poverty. However, when the schools' poverty levels were controlled for, the results percent of the graduates of the nation's public schools had taken a geometry course.⁴ At suburban schools, 73 percent of students had enrolled in a geometry course, compared with 57 percent of urban students. And 60 percent of students who attended high poverty schools had taken geometry compared with nearly 74 percent of students at low poverty schools. However, when the study controlled for the level of poverty, there was no statistical difference among urban, rural or suburban students who had enrolled in a geometry course. To raise the educational achievement of all students, advanced placement as well as college-prep courses such as Algebra and geometry, biology, chemistry, three years of English and other core subjects must be offered so that students will be prepared for college even if they elect not to attend a four-year college or university.

AFRICAN AMERICAN COLLEGE ENROLLMENT AND ATTAINMENT

Given the increases in African American high school graduation around the 1970's, it would not have been unreasonable to expect a larger share of African Americans to attend and graduate from college. In 1975, the college-going rate for all Americans was 36.2 percent, compared to a rate of 32.8 percent for African Americans (Carter and Wilson, 1997). But in 1995, the proportion of African American high school graduates who were enrolled in college decreased by almost two percentage points to 34.4 percent, compared to a national average that increased six percent to 42 percent.

TABLE 8—COLLEGE-GOING RATE OF HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATES: 1975 AND 1995

Year	Overall	African-Americans
1975	36.2%	32.8%
1995	42%	34.4%

Source: Carter, D. and Wilson, R. (1997). Minorities in Higher Education. Fifteenth Annual Status Report, 1996–1997. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

While college enrollment statistics have fluctuated since the peak year of the mid 1970's when slightly more than one million African American students (1,033,000) were attending college, almost one and a half million (1,400,000) African Americans were enrolled in college in 1995 (Hoffman, Snyder and Sonneberg, 1996). Despite the increase of almost four million more African American students in college between 1976 and 1995, the ratio of those attending four-year and two-year institutions did not change; 59 percent attended four-year institutions compared to 41 percent who were enrolled at two-year colleges and universities.⁵ Thus, the larger number of black students in college in the 1990's cannot be viewed as a major gain since a significant amount are enrolled in two-year institutions. Furthermore, much of the growth in postsecondary attendance by blacks over the last twenty years is due to a sizable increase of African American women who enrolled in college.

TABLE 9—1994 AND 1995 COLLEGE ENROLLMENT OF AFRICAN-AMERICANS BY GENDER

Year	Males	Females	Total
1994	550,000	899,000	1,449,000
1995	556,000	918,000	1,474,000

Source: Carter, D. and Wilson, R. (1997). Minorities in Higher Education. Fifteenth Annual Status Report, 1996–1997. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

POSTSECONDARY DEGREE ATTAINMENT

The best way to determine whether any gains in college access have been realized for African Americans over the last two decades is by reviewing the amount of degrees received during this period. Regrettably though, the data show that there has not been consistent annual increases in some of the degree categories since 1976. More African Americans, for example, received baccalaureate degrees in 1976 and 1981 than in 1985. In 1976 and 1981, African Americans received an average of slightly more than 59,000 bachelor's degrees (59,122 and 60,673 baccalaureate degrees, respectively), or about 6.5% of the total degrees awarded, compared to 57,473 undergraduate degrees in 1985, or 5.9% of the total (Carter and Wilson, 1989). Thus, the 1981 and 1985 totals for African Americans at the baccalaureate level showed a decline in both the number and percentage of degrees awarded when compared to 1976. In the 1990's, however, the percentage increased from 6% of the total awarded in 1991 (65,341 degrees) to a high of 7.2% in 1994 (83,576).⁶

TABLE 10—BACCALAUREATE DEGREES AWARDED TO AFRICAN-AMERICANS FOR SELECTED YEARS: 1976–1994

Year	African-American baccalaureate degrees	Percent of total degrees awarded
1976	59,122	6.5
1981	60,673	6.5
1985	57,473	5.9
1991	65,341	6
1994	83,576	7.2

Source: Carter, D.J. and Wilson, R. Minorities in Higher Education: Eighth Annual Status Report, 1997. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

As has been mentioned earlier, the gains by African Americans at the bachelor's degree level are primarily attributed to the significant increases by black women who

completed their undergraduate studies. In 1976, for example, the number of African American women who received baccalaureate degrees was 33,489, compared to 25,026 that were awarded to African American men—a difference of almost 8,000 degrees. Ten years later, African American women received 34,056 undergraduate degrees compared to 22,499 that were awarded to African men—or roughly 11,000 more (Gordon and Brown, 1990). In 1994, the gap was even wider as 22,000 more African American women received baccalaureate degrees (52,928 versus 30,648) than did men. This pattern of almost 20,000 more bachelor's degrees awarded to African American women has been consistently occurring since the early 1990's.

TABLE 11—1976, 1986 AND 1994 BACCALAUREATE DEGREES AWARDED TO AFRICAN-AMERICANS BY GENDER

Year	Black male baccalaureate	Black female baccalaureate	Difference
1976	25,026	33,489	8,463
1986	22,499	34,056	11,557
1994	30,648	52,928	22,280

Source: (1) Gordon, P. and Brown, P. (1990). Degrees conferred in institutions of higher education, by race and sex: 1976–77 through 1986–87. National Center for Education Statistics and (2) Carter, D. and Wilson, R. (1997). Minorities in Higher Education. Fifteenth Annual Status Report, 1996–1997. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

Overall increases of black baccalaureate recipients were partly due to the rising number of undergraduate awards made by historically black colleges and universities. In 1985, HBCUs awarded 16,326 bachelor's degrees; between 1991 and 1994, HBCUs awarded an average of almost 21,000 degrees to African Americans.⁷ Thus, HBCUs annually accounted for approximately 28% of all undergraduate degrees to African Americans between 1985 and 1994, compared to the late 1970's and early 1980's when they accounted for between 35% and 32% of all black bachelor's degrees.⁸ Nevertheless, this is still a favorable sign that HBCUs, which represent barely three percent of all American colleges and universities, continue to enroll and graduate a significant number of students even though African American students have much more access to other institutions of higher education.

Table 12—Baccalaureate degrees awarded to African Americans by HBCUs for selected years: 1985–1994

Year	HBCU baccalaureates
1985	16,326
1991	17,930
1992	19,693
1993	22,020
1994	23,434

Source: Hoffman, C., Snyder, T. and Sonneberg, B. (1996). Historically Black Colleges and Universities: 1976–1994. National Center for Education Statistics.

TABLE 15—FIRST-PROFESSIONAL DEGREES AWARDED TO AFRICAN-AMERICANS FOR SELECTED YEARS: 1977–1994

Year	First-professional degrees awarded	Percent of total awarded annually
1977	2,536	4
1979	2,836	4
1981	2,931	4
1985	3,029	4.3
1991	3,575	5
1993	4,100	5.5
1994	4,444	5.9

Source: Carter, D. and Wilson, R. (1997). Minorities in Higher Education. Fifteenth Annual Status Report, 1996–1997. Washington, DC: American Council on Education.

CONCLUSION

Based on all of the data that have been presented—from the elementary grades to first-professional degrees, it is fair to say that there has been both progress and regression with respect to African Americans' educational attainment and achievement over the last four decades. This mixed assess-

ment, however, should not be viewed as a sign of discouragement; rather it should be used as a source of motivation to improve further those conditions that require immediate attention. Additionally, it is imperative that positive trends such as higher graduation rates from high school, improved performance on selected tests and educational measures, successful school programs, successful students, the continued contributions of Historically Black Colleges and Universities to baccalaureate, graduate, and first-professional degree production, and to the preparation of African American teachers, to name just a few signs, must be constantly emphasized. At the same time, however, it is necessary that those negative indicators which can be improved are addressed; more rigorous curricula, higher educational standards and expectations for students, higher expectations by teachers, increased involvement by parents, and so forth.

It may not be as easy to change the segregated composition of the public schools where so many African Americans are currently enrolled, or the numbers of students who come from poor backgrounds in those schools, but it is possible to exercise our civic duty and inquire what can be done to reduce class sizes, to sustain reading and mathematics performance beyond the fourth grade, to offer more college prep and advanced placement courses, and to provide comprehensive career counseling for students. Furthermore, it is our responsibility to find out why there are few gifted and talented programs in public schools, why African Americans account for almost 30 percent of all students in special education classes, and why more students do not achieve at higher levels of proficiency on various subject matter tests. It is also our obligation to resolve why 41% of African American college students are attending two-year institutions, why 350,000 more African American women than men are attending college today compared to a difference of 200,000 up to 1984, and why little, if any, gains are being made at the doctoral level. These are indeed challenging issues and questions which signal that serious work is needed to reduce the many inequities that still exist in the schools attended by African American students. Change and real growth are possible, but hope must be supported by commitment to standards, carefully designed educational programs, systematic action and the realization that success is within reach. With the belief and conviction that the glass of "educational opportunity" is half full, we can help to fulfill the dreams of those numerous African American parents who expect their children to attend college and be productive citizens in the 21st Century.

FOOTNOTES

¹This presentation is based on the 18th Annual Charles H. Thompson lecture—Four Decades of Progress... and Decline: An Assessment of African American Educational Attainment—delivered at Howard University in November 1997. The lecture will be published in the Winter 1997/Spring 1998 issue of The Journal of Negro Education (Vol. 66, No. 1-2).

²Minority students accounted for 32 percent of those who took the SAT in 1997 compared to 22 percent in 1987. And 60 percent of the 1997 freshmen (959,301 students) took the ACT, compared to 817,076 in 1990.

³In this study, 40 percent of urban students attended schools with poverty concentrations of 40 percent or more, and only 12 percent of urban students attended low poverty schools. However, only 10 percent of suburban students and 25 percent of rural students attended high poverty schools; and 36 percent of suburban students attend low poverty schools.

⁴Geometry was chosen by NAEP because the patterns for students who had enrolled in this course were similar to those for students who had taken science, foreign language and other advanced courses.

⁵In 1976, almost 604,000 African American students attended four-year institutions, and a little more than 429,000 attended two-year institutions. In 1995, almost 834,000 African American students attended four-year institutions and 614,000 were enrolled at two-year institutions.

⁶African American baccalaureates rose to 72,346 in 1992, or 6.4% of the total, and 77,782 in 1993, or 6.7% of the total.

⁷The annual number of bachelor's degrees awarded to African Americans by HBCUs for 1991, 1992, 1993 and 1994 were 17,930, 19,693, 22,020, and 23,434, respectively.

⁸In 1977 and 1981, African Americans received 58,515 and 60,673 bachelors degrees, respectively. HBCUs awarded 20,754 and 19,556 degrees to African Americans, respectively, or 35% and 32% of the total (Gordon and Brown, 1990).

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CRANE (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. RUSH of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business.

Mr. YATES (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of physical reasons.

Mr. TURNER (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today, on account of official business in the district.

Mr. MARTINEZ (at the request of Mr. GEPHARDT) for today and Wednesday, March 18, on account of an unexpected emergency.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART (at the request of Mr. ARMEY) for today, on account of illness.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

By unanimous consent, permission to address the House, following the legislative program and any special orders heretofore entered, was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mrs. TAUSCHER, for 5 minutes.

Ms. NORTON, for 5 minutes.

Ms. DELAURO, for 5 minutes.

Mr. PALLONE, for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas, for 5 minutes.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UPTON) to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material:)

Mr. ISTOOK, for 5 minutes, today.

Mrs. MORELLA, for 5 minutes, March 18.

Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, for 5 minutes, March 18.

Mr. MICA, for 5 minutes, today.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, for 5 minutes, March 18.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

By unanimous consent, permission to revise and extend remarks was granted to:

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. HINCHEY) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. KIND.

Mr. KILDEE.

Mr. RAHALL.

Mr. TRAFICANT.

Mr. STOKES.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

Mr. HAMILTON.

Mr. PAYNE.

Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

Mr. KLINK.

Mr. MANTON.

Mrs. LOWEY.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas.

Mr. CARDIN.

Mr. TOWNS.

Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri.

Mr. STARK.

Mrs. MCCARTHY of New York.

Mrs. DEUTSCH.

Mr. FARR of California.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. UPTON) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SOLOMON.

Mr. OXLEY.

Mr. SUNUNU.

Mr. FAWELL.

Mr. LEWIS of California.

Mr. GINGRICH.

Mr. SAXTON.

Mr. RILEY.

Mr. GOODLING.

Mr. MCKEON.

Mrs. MORELLA.

Mr. COLLINS.

(The following Members (at the request of Mr. OWENS) and to include extraneous matter:)

Mr. SABO.

Mr. HALL of Ohio.

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey.

Mr. LANTOS.

Mr. ROEMER.

Mr. KANJORSKI.

Mr. HINOJOSA.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. OWENS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 18, 1998, at 10 a.m.

OATH OF OFFICE OF MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates to the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, A B, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will

well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Members of the 105th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

Honorable LOIS CAPPS, Twenty-second District, California.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

8050. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting a report on Detargeting Russian Strategic Missiles, pursuant to Public Law 105-85, section 1301; to the Committee on National Security.

8051. A letter from the Assistant to the Board of Governors, Federal Reserve System, transmitting the System's final rule—Electronic Fund Transfers [Regulation E; Docket No. R-1002] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

8052. A letter from the Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule—Code of Federal Regulations; Authority Citations; Technical Amendment [Docket No. 97N-0365] received March 17, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8053. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; California State Implementation Plan Revision, South Coast Air Quality Management District [CA-169-0065; FRL-5974-6] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8054. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants and Control Techniques Guideline Document for Source Categories: Aerospace Manufacturing and Rework Facilities [AD-FRL-5978-4] (RIN: 2060-AE02) received March 13, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8055. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Technical Amendments to Clean Air Act Interim Approval of Operating Permits Program; Commonwealth of Virginia; Correction of Effective Date Under Congressional Review Act (CRA) [FRL-5983-7] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8056. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plan; Illinois [IL167-1a; FRL-5978-8] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8057. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of State Plans for Designated Facilities and Pollutants; Kansas; Control of

Landfill Gas Emissions from Existing Municipal Solid Waste Landfills [KS 044-1044a; FRL-5979-7] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8058. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; and Designation of Areas for Air Quality Planning Purposes; State of Iowa [IA 040-1040 (a); FRL-5980-2] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8059. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulatory Management and Information, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule—Approval and Promulgation of Implementation Plans; Ohio [OH112-1a; FRL- 5976-9] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8060. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule—New Disclosure Option for Open-End Management Investment Companies (RIN: 3235-AH03) received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8061. A letter from the Deputy Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's "Major" final rule—Registration Form Used by Open-End Management Investment Companies (RIN: 3235-AE46) received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Commerce.

8062. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Deep-water Species Fishery by Vessels using Trawl Gear in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No. 971208297-8054-02; I.D. 031098A] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8063. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Sablefish Managed Under the IFQ Program [I.D. 030298A] received March 14, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8064. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Species in the Rock Sole/Flathead Sole/"Other Flatfish" Fishery Category by Vessels Using Trawl Gear in Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No. 971208296-7296-01; I.D. 030498D] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8065. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Fisheries, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule—Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; Final 1998 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish [Docket No. 971208298-8055-02; I.D. 112097B] received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on Resources.

8066. A letter from the Director, Federal Bureau of Investigation, transmitting the Bureau's final rule—Implementation of Section 104 of the Communications Assistance for Law Enforcement Act—received March 16, 1998, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2864. A bill to require the Secretary of Labor to establish a program under which employers may consult with State officials respecting compliance with occupational safety and health requirements; with an amendment (Rept. 105-444). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 2877. A bill to amend the Occupational Safety and Health Act of 1970; with an amendment (Rept. 105-445). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. GOODLING: Committee on Education and the Workforce. H.R. 3096. A bill to correct a provision relating to termination of benefits for convicted persons (Rept 105-446). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3039. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to guarantee loans to provide multifamily transitional housing for homeless veterans, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 105-447). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. STUMP: Committee on Veterans' Affairs. H.R. 3213. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to clarify enforcement of veterans' employment rights with respect to a State as an employer or a private employer, to extend veterans' employment and reemployment rights to members of the uniformed services employed abroad by United States companies, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. 105-448). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS of Washington: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 388. Resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2870) to amend the Foreign Assistance Act of 1961 to facilitate protection of tropical forests through debt reduction with developing countries with tropical forests (Rept. 105-449). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. TALENT: Committee on Small Business. H.R. 3412. A bill to amend and make technical corrections in title III of the Small Business Investment Act; with an amendment (Rept. 105-450). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 5 of Rule X and clause 4 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. DOOLITTLE (for himself, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. SMITH of Oregon, Mrs. CHENOWETH, Mr. RIGGS, Mr. HERGER, Mr. RADANOVICH, Mr. POMBO, and Mr. THOMAS):

H.R. 3467. A bill to address the protection of the California spotted owl and its habitat in the Sierran Province of Region 5 of the Forest Service through the use of an interim management direction consistent with the requirements of existing public land management and environmental laws and by setting a date certain for the completion of a final environmental impact statement for the management of the California spotted owl; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. BARR of Georgia:

H.R. 3468. A bill providing that certain intermodal transportation facilities not be exempt from local zoning ordinances; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. CARDIN:

H.R. 3469. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act, the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974, and the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to require that group and individual health insurance coverage and group health plans provide for external appeals in the case of adverse determinations involving experimental treatment, significant costs, or a serious medical condition; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself, Mr. BROWN

of Ohio, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. RANGEL, Mr. DINGELL, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BORSKI, Mr. BROWN of California, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mrs. CLAYTON, Mr. COYNE, Ms. DELAUNO, Mr. DEUTSCH, Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FILNER, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. FROST, Mr. GONZALEZ, Mr. GREEN, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Mr. HINCHAY, Mr. HOYER, Mr. JEFFERSON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MATSUI, Mr. MCDERMOTT, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. MEEKS of New York, Mr. MENENDEZ, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. MURTHA, Mr. NADLER, Mr. OLIVER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SANDLIN, Mr. SCHUMER, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. STOKES, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. TOWNS, Mr. UNDERWOOD, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. WEYGAND, Mr. WISE, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. YATES, Mr. OBERSTAR, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 3470. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act and the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 to improve access to health insurance and Medicare benefits for individuals ages 55 to 65 to be fully funded through premiums and anti-fraud provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. STARK (for himself and Mr. BROWN of Ohio):

H.R. 3471. A bill to amend titles XI and XVIII of the Social Security Act to combat waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicare Program; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Commerce, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COOK:

H.R. 3472. A bill to amend the Bank Protection Act of 1968 for purposes of facilitating the use of electronic authentication techniques by financial institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Financial Services.

By Mr. FAWELL (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, Mr. MCKEON, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. ROEMER, and Mr. PETRI):

H.R. 3473. A bill to amend the Age Discrimination in Employment Act of 1967 to allow institutions of higher education to offer faculty members who are serving under a contract or arrangement providing for unlimited tenure, benefits on voluntary retirement that are reduced or eliminated on the basis of age, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. FAZIO of California (for himself, Mr. GEPHARDT, Mr. BONIOR, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. SAWYER, Mr. MEEHAN, Mr. ACKERMAN, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. BECERRA, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. BROWN of California, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. DELAHUNT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. FARR of California, Mr. FORD, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. LAFALCE, Mr. LAMPSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. MATSUI, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. MINGE, Mr. NADLER, Ms. NORTON, Mr. OBERSTAR, Mr. OLVER, Mr. POMEROY, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. STOKES, Mrs. TAUSCHER, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. WEXLER, Ms. WOOLSEY, Mr. UNDERWOOD, and Mr. YATES):

H.R. 3474. A bill to help parents keep their children from starting to use tobacco products, to expose the tobacco industry's past misconduct and to stop the tobacco industry from targeting children, to eliminate or greatly reduce the illegal use of tobacco products by children, to improve the public health by reducing the overall use of tobacco products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, the Judiciary, and Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut:

H.R. 3475. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow a deduction for the health insurance costs of all individuals who are not eligible to participate in employer-subsidized health plans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LEVIN:

H.R. 3476. A bill to reform the financing of Federal elections; to the Committee on House Oversight, and in addition to the Committees on Ways and Means, Education and the Workforce, Government Reform and Oversight, and the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MATSUI:

H.R. 3477. A bill to suspend temporarily the duty on a certain drug substance used in the formulation of HIV Antiviral Drug; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MCINNIS (for himself, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. HEFLEY, Mr. BOB SCHAFFER, Mr. DAN SCHAEFER of Colorado, and Mr. SKEEN):

H.R. 3478. A bill to amend the Colorado Ute Indian Water Rights Settlement Act to provide for a final settlement of the claims of the Colorado Ute Indian Tribes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Resources.

By Mr. MCKEON (for himself, Mr. GOODLING, and Mr. CASTLE):

H.R. 3479. A bill to provide for the implementation of recommendations of the National Commission on the Cost of Higher Education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. MOLLOHAN:

H.R. 3480. A bill to reduce temporarily the duty on ethylene/tetrafluoroethylene copolymer (ETFE); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROEMER:

H.R. 3481. A bill to require the Occupational Safety and Health Administration to recognize that electronic forms of providing MSDSs provide the same level of access to information as paper copies; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. WAXMAN:

H.R. 3482. A bill to designate the Federal building located at 11000 Wilshire Boulevard in Los Angeles, California, as the "ABRAHAM LINCOLN Federal Building"; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. FRANKS of New Jersey:

H. Con. Res. 244. Concurrent resolution calling on the Government of Cuba to extradite Joanne Chesimard from Cuba to the United States; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mr. KING of New York (for himself, Mr. GILMAN, Mr. MANTON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, and Mr. WALSH):

H. Con. Res. 245. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress that the settlement of the decades-long conflict in the North of Ireland should address a number of specific issues in order to foster a just and lasting peace; to the Committee on International Relations.

By Mrs. MORELLA (for herself, Mr. SAWYER, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. FILNER, Mr. BALDACCIO, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. CARDIN, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. ENGEL, and Mr. DINGELL):

H. Con. Res. 246. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of the Congress with respect to the collection of demographic, social, and economic data as part of the 2000 decennial census of population; to the Committee on Government Reform and Oversight.

By Mr. BOEHNER:

H. Res. 386. A resolution electing the Honorable Richard K. Arney of Texas to act as Speaker pro tempore; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. HOYER (for himself, Mr. GEJDENSON, Ms. KILPATRICK, Mr. MOAKLEY, Mr. FROST, Mr. HALL of Ohio, and Ms. SLAUGHTER):

H. Res. 387. A resolution prohibiting the payment of any amount from the reserve fund established for unanticipated expenses of committees without the approval of the House; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII,

Mr. RANGEL introduced A bill (H.R. 3483) to provide for the liquidation or reliquidation of certain entries; which was referred to the Committee on Ways and Means.

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 4: Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 96: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington.

H.R. 198: Mr. SMITH of Oregon.

H.R. 230: Mr. CUNNINGHAM.

H.R. 306: Mr. KUCINICH.

H.R. 457: Mr. FOLEY and Mr. GILMAN.

H.R. 687: Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA and Ms. FURSE.

H.R. 758: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 773: Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts.

H.R. 814: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 979: Mr. JONES, Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SHAYS, Mr. MCHALE, Mr. GREENWOOD, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. PAUL, and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 981: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 983: Ms. SANCHEZ.

H.R. 1126: Mr. McDERMOTT and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 1166: Mrs. LOWEY.

H.R. 1173: Mr. KLINK, Mr. COYNE, and Mrs. CLAYTON.

H.R. 1215: Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 1231: Mr. STARK.

H.R. 1261: Mr. MCDADE and Mr. BLILEY.

H.R. 1369: Mr. ENSIGN.

H.R. 1375: Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. COX of California, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. FORBES, Mr. MEEKS of New York, and Mr. FARR of California.

H.R. 1401: Mr. RIGGS, Mr. DOOLEY of California, and Mr. MILLER of California.

H.R. 1505: Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 1525: Mr. GREEN.

H.R. 1531: Mr. SHERMAN and Mr. FORBES.

H.R. 1595: Mr. SHADEGG.

H.R. 1601: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. EVANS, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 1605: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1614: Mr. KLUG.

H.R. 1656: Mr. BOSWELL and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1689: Mr. CANNON, Mr. REDMOND, Ms. VELAZQUEZ, Mr. LANTOS, Mrs. MORELLA, and Mr. ARCHER.

H.R. 1704: Mr. CONDIT.

H.R. 1732: Mrs. TAUSCHER.

H.R. 1788: Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 1872: Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts.

H.R. 2019: Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. MCCRERY, and Mr. COOKSEY.

H.R. 2020: Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. ALLEN, Ms. DEGETTE, and Mr. DELAHUNT.

H.R. 2023: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. LUTHER.

H.R. 2321: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 2380: Mr. EHRLICH.

H.R. 2400: Mr. SCARBOROUGH and Mr. FOSSELLA.

H.R. 2431: Mr. CHRISTENSEN and Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 2454: Mr. ROTHMAN, Mr. MARTINEZ, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2457: Mr. MARTINEZ and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2500: Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GRAHAM, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2509: Mr. CUNNINGHAM, Mr. CALVERT, Mr. FOLEY, Mr. BOUCHER, and Mr. BARCIA of Michigan.

H.R. 2525: Mr. BLAGOJEVICH.

H.R. 2549: Mr. FROST, Mrs. THURMAN, Mr. FILNER, and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 2568: Mr. SOUDER.

H.R. 2609: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 2635: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GILMAN, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. TRAFICANT, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. WAXMAN, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. LAHOOD, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2670: Mrs. ROUKEMA, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. GOSS, and Mr. ACKERMAN.

H.R. 2695: Mr. BERMAN and Mr. MATSUI.

H.R. 2701: Mr. MASCARA.

H.R. 2714: Mr. FATTAH.

H.R. 2723: Mr. TIAHRT.

H.R. 2728: Mr. PORTER.

H.R. 2733: Mr. STEARNS, Mr. GEJDENSON, Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington, Mr. GOODE, Mr. JONES, Mr. SPENCE, Mr. HOBSON, Mr. FORD, Mr. SABO, Mr. BISHOP, Mr. EDWARDS, Ms. DANNER, Mr. JENKINS, Mr. HUTCHINSON, Mr. HINCHEY, Mr. HASTINGS of Florida, Ms. PRYCE of Ohio, Mr. GOODLATTE, Ms. PELOSI, Ms. DEGETTE, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. ADERHOLT, Mr. BARR of Georgia, Mr. CHRISTENSEN, Mr. MARTINEZ, Mr. KLECZKA, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr.

MORAN of Virginia, Mr. STUPAK, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TAYLOR of Mississippi, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2754: Mr. SANDERS, Mr. MALONEY of Connecticut, Mr. STOKES, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 2821: Mr. DICKEY, Mr. SOUDER, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.

H.R. 2829: Mr. CONDIT, Mr. DOOLITTLE, Mr. GILLMOR, Mr. PEASE, and Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 2840: Mr. HASTINGS of Washington, Mrs. MYRICK, and Mrs. NORTHUP.

H.R. 2853: Mr. DELAHUNT, Mr. FROST, and Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island.

H.R. 2868: Mr. BONILLA.

H.R. 2912: Mr. ALLEN, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, and Mr. ORTIZ.

H.R. 2914: Mr. MINGE.

H.R. 2921: Mr. STRICKLAND, Mr. SAM JOHNSON, Mr. NEAL of Massachusetts, Mr. MILLER of California, Mr. GILMAN, and Mr. THOMPSON.

H.R. 2931: Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DIXON, Mr. BROWN of Ohio, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TIERNEY.

H.R. 2938: Mr. BARTON of Texas, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. HALL of Texas, and Mr. HASTINGS of Florida.

H.R. 2951: Mr. CHABOT.

H.R. 2970: Mr. ACHERMAN, Mr. SHAYS, and Mr. SNYDER.

H.R. 2983: Mr. DOOLEY of California, Mr. RUSH, Mr. TORRES, and Mr. McNULTY.

H.R. 2990: Mr. PAYNE, Ms. RIVERS, Mr. GREENWOOD, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. RAHALL, Mr. EHLERS, Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania, Mr. HULSHOF, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOYLE, Mr. NEY, Mr. PAUL, Ms. MCCARTHY of Missouri, Mr. UPTON, Mr. MCINTYRE, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 3032: Mr. SKAGGS.

H.R. 3131: Mr. CONYERS and Mr. STARK.

H.R. 3144: Mr. REDMOND and Mr. SHAYS.

H.R. 3146: Mr. BERMAN

H.R. 3148: Mr. BLUNT.

H.R. 3152: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. RADANOVICH.

H.R. 3153: Mr. ADAM SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3156: Mrs. MORELLA, Mr. GANSKE, Mr. PORTER, Mr. STARK, Mr. BARRETT of Nebraska, Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, Mr. JEFFERSON, Mr. STOKES, and Mrs. MEEK of Florida.

H.R. 3162: Ms. GRANGER.

H.R. 3168: Mr. QUINN and Mr. GOODLATE.

H.R. 3174: Mr. HALL of Texas.

H.R. 3205: Mr. NEY, Mr. BOSWELL, Mr. ORTIZ, Mr. DICKS, and Mr. FOLEY.

H.R. 3216: Mrs. MEEK of Florida, Mr. FRANK of Massachusetts, Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. KENNEDY of Massachusetts, Mr. RODRIGUEZ, Mr. SKAGGS, and Mr. WAXMAN.

H.R. 3217: Mr. GINGRICH and Mr. RAMSTAD.

H.R. 3240: Mr. LANTOS.

H.R. 3246: Mr. WELDON of Florida.

H.R. 3255: Mr. KLECZKA and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3260: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 3269: Mr. KUCINICH, Mr. LANTOS, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3279: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 3291: Mr. TRAFICANT.

H.R. 3293: Mr. TOWNS, Ms. JACKSON-LEE, and Mr. FILNER.

H.R. 3295: Mr. TIERNEY, Mr. FATTAH, Mrs. MALONEY of New York, Mr. MARKEY, and Mr. SPRATT.

H.R. 3297: Mr. PICKETT.

H.R. 3336: Mr. DAVIS of Florida, Mr. BILIRAKIS, Mr. DEUTSCH, and Mr. WEXLER.

H.R. 3376: Mr. BILBRAY.

H.R. 3400: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3435: Mr. ENGLISH of Pennsylvania, Mrs. JOHNSON of Connecticut, and Mr. CHRISTENSEN.

H. Con. Res. 158: Mr. FOSSELLA.

H. Con. Res. 188: Mr. STARK.

H. Con. Res. 203: Mr. CLYBURN and Mr. WEYGAND.

H. Con. Res. 210: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. DOYLE.

H. Con. Res. 212: Ms. DANNER, Mr. REDMOND, Mr. MANZULLO, Mr. WALSH, Mr. BLUNT, Mr. THORNBERRY, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. POMEROY.

H. Con. Res. 214: Mr. CLEMENT.

H. Con. Res. 218: Mr. LEACH.

H. Con. Res. 233: Mr. FAZIO of California.

H. Con. Res. 235: Mr. NADLER.

H. Res. 212: Mr. HILLIARD, Mr. JACKSON, Mr. LANTOS, Mr. MILLER of California, Ms. RIVERS, and Mr. BOB SCHAFFER.

H. Res. 247: Mr. DEFazio.

H. Res. 358: Ms. MILLENDER-MCDONALD, Mr. SANDLIN, and Mr. LANTOS.

H. Res. 361: Mr. HAMILTON, Mr. LEACH, Mr. FALEOMAVAEGA, Mr. SMITH of New Jersey, and Mr. FOX of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 381: Mr. WATTS of Oklahoma, Mr. NETHERCUTT, and Mr. ADERHOLT.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions as follows:

H.R. 1415: Mr. DREIER.